

Notes on History

[WORLD HISTORY]

28 OCT 1987

C O N T E N T S

<u>Sl.No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>pages</u>
1.	INSTRUCTIONS	
	Approaching the Syllabus	1 - 2
	How to go about with one's preparations?	2 - 8
	Nature of Questions	8
	How to read the material?	9
2.	OVERVIEW OF WORLD HISTORY	10 - 16
3.	ROLE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY IN WORLD HISTORY	17 - 20
<u>PAPER II : SECTION B : SUB-SECTION A</u>		
4.	INTRODUCING MERCANTILISM	21 - 23
	Nature and Thought of Mercantilism	24 - 28
	Factors/Forces Promoting Mercantilism	28 - 30
	Features of Mature Mercantilism	30 - 35
	Critique of Mercantilism	35 - 42
5.	INTRODUCING CAPITALISM	43 - 46
	Origins of Capitalism	47 - 51
	Development of Capitalism in Britain	51- 54
	Development of Capitalism in France	54 - 56
	Development of Capitalism in Germany	57- 58
	Development of Capitalism in Japan	59 - 62
6.	AGRICULTURAL REVOLUTION 16TH TO THE 18TH CENTURIES	63 - 72
7.	TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION LEADING TO FACTORY INDUSTRIES	73 - 78
	Spread of Technology and Factory System	79 - 80

PAPER II : MODERN WORLD : SECTION C

15.	EGYPT	<u>319 - 352</u>
	MOHAMED ALI (1805 - 1849)	319 - 327
	SAID PASHA (1854 - 1863)	328 - 330
	ISMAIL PASHA (1863 - 1879)	331 - 337
	COLONISATION OF EGYPTIAN ECONOMY (1876 - 1920)	338 - 345
	ANTI-IMPERIALIST MOVEMENT OF EGYPT	346 - 352
16.	DUTCH COLONIALISM IN INDONESIA IN THE 19TH CENTURY	353 - 364
17.	ANTI-IMPERIALIST MOVEMENT IN INDONESIA	365 - 375
18.	ANTI-IMPERIALIST MOVEMENT IN INDO-CHINA	376 - 382
	<u>CHINA</u>	<u>383 - 422</u>
19.	OVERVIEW OF CHINESE HISTORY	383 - 387
20.	THE OPIUM WARS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TREATY PORT SYSTEM IN CHINA BETWEEN 1840 AND 1860	388 - 394
21.	FINANCE CAPITAL IN CHINA (1895 - 1914)	395 - 400
22.	REVOLUTION IN CHINA FROM 1919 TO 1949	401 - 414
23.	ANTI-IMPERIALIST MOVEMENT IN CHINA	415 - 422
24.	STAGE OF COLONIALISM IN INDIA: MERCANTILIST, FREE TRADE AND FINANCE CAPITAL	423 - 427
25.	COMPARING NATIONALIST MOVEMENTS IN ASIA	428 - 436

INSTRUCTIONS

APPROACHING THE SYLLABUS

The syllabus of any subject spells out in detail on what the candidates are expected to study. The syllabus for the history paper in the Main Examination is of two parts, one for Paper I and the other Paper II. The syllabus for the first paper is further divided into two parts, one dealing with Ancient India and the other with Medieval India ending with the 18th century. In Paper II, the first part relates to Modern India; and the second part consists of three the segments: the first dealing with the forces or movements of modern world; the second dealing with segments of traditional European History; and the third dealing with some select topics relating to non-European part of World History. Taking the whole syllabus as one entity, the major thrust is towards the study of the developments and movements which throw light on modern times.

Although there is a unifying principle governing the whole syllabus, unfortunately the various parts that are incorporated in the syllabus for both Papers I and II are not "broadly of B.A.(Hons) level" as claimed in the prospectus of the UPSC. Very often, select topics from the M.A. syllabi of some select universities have been lifted up. Added to this slant, there is an attempt to give a leftist orientation to the syllabus, more so for Paper II.

However, we can make some sense out of the syllabus that is before us, but the way in which papers are being set is rather unfortunate. Fortunately, the syllabus for the 1981 Examination has corrected the weaknesses of the syllabus as laid down in the previous years' prospectuses. Even then, some amount of ambiguity is left in Section B of Paper II; within this section look at item II and IV in sub-section (B). The wording of these two items has not been changed in 1981. In the previous years, examiners, while setting questions

required for the purpose of making the best use of the material that is being sent from this end. Regarding sub-section A of Section B in Paper II, the same difficulty is there. For some esoteric topics you have to consult four to five books. You have no other go but to rely on the encyclopaedia.

To have some general idea of all the topics prescribed in Section A of Paper II, you should go through the NCERT book by Bipan Chandra and the book Freedom Struggle written by Barun De, Tripathi and Bipan Chandra.

And with regard to the first paper, you can go through the NCERT book by B.S. Sharma (Ancient India) and for Medieval India the portion from Advanced History of India by Roy Chowdhury, Dutta and Majumdar. Indeed, the material that you find in these books does not enable you to get the feel of the various items included in Paper I. It just cannot be helped; and you have no other go but to depend on the material that is being sent to you.

Faced with these difficulties, what can a sensible student do? The first and foremost expectation is that you trust in what is being said here. The day you have a faith in the material that is being sent to you, and if you follow the instructions that are given below on how to answer questions in the examination, you would be very safe. Incidentally, please remember that the performance of candidates offering History in 1979, 1980 and 1981 has revealed certain features:

- (a) students have scored better in Paper I than in Paper II; and
- (b) the average marks secured by candidates in the first 200 of the Selection Lists for all the four years is about 54.30%.

only after you have understood it fully, and please do not take any chances in just writing whatever you want to without knowing what the examiner expects of you.

- (b) The answers must be ☒ self-explanatory, i.e., they should be intelligible even to a good student who was in the first year degree class of a standard university. It does not pay you to write in a scholarly manner. Never assume that the examiner knows the subject. In other words, do not build your answers on some assumptions. Everything that you write must be very clear and intelligible even to an average reader.
- (c) You must develop your answers in ☒ a very systematic manner. After having done so, if you can give ☒ depth to the answer (i.e. taking it to higher levels), you should do it. See for yourself that it is not a taboo in the Civil Services Examination to write very good answers. The only thing is that you must begin at the beginning and then build it up to the level that you can.
- (d) ☒ No quotations, no reference to schools of thought, and no reference to authorities: the answers must be your own. You may be surprised to know that every year the examiners are fond of making ☒ one remark on the performance of the candidates: lack of freshness and originality of thinking. It may be difficult to be original and you can forget about this thing. But you can always ☒ write in a fresh manner provided you are writing in a very simple and direct manner. By the way, please remember that no style is

(b) you should show a very clear understanding of the question and also the basics or fundamentals of the themes you are dealing with; and

(c) ~~you should bring in the required critical approach.~~ If you fulfil all these qualities, nobody can stop you from securing 55 per cent marks. And if by chance you happen to have more number of points and/or your presentation happens to be superior, you secure more marks.

Before closing these instructions, we would like to clarify two points mentioned in the above paragraph.

✓ How to lay bare the basics involved in a theme? This requirement can be fulfilled if you have a picture or story-like view of all the topics in each of the papers. This is a must: without acquiring this kind of knowledge, your performance in the examination would be a matter of gamble. For knowing the subject-matter in such a manner, you must think of what you have read.

Do like this. After reading each topic, ✓ think of the content and the spirit of the topic; and after completing 10-15 topics that can be grouped as one entity, you have to again think of the essence of all the topics put together and the content of the topics in a very brief manner. Such a practice alone would enable you to have a picture or a story-like view of the syllabus for each of the papers. Thus, you would be having four pictures of Paper II (one of Section (A) and three of Section (B)) and ^{two} pictures in the context of Paper I. And if you are little more sharp in mind, you can view the whole of Section B in Paper II as one picture, and, therefore, the whole of Paper II would be in only two pictures.

HOW TO READ THE MATERIAL?

As already mentioned in the previous pages, the material before you covers every item or theme mentioned in the syllabus for both the Papers. Before choosing to read any one segment of the material, it is expected of you that you have already read some book of your own choice. Such a reading would enable you to appreciate better the value of the material. And while reading the material, you must make your own points, and that too in your own English, so that you can very easily remember on the day of the Examination what you had read in the material.

One warning here: do not anticipate any questions. You have no choice but to know something about every item or theme that is mentioned in the syllabus. We have already mentioned earlier that the examiners are tending to repeat questions and also pick up a little out-of-the-way themes or topics for the compulsory questions.

In the end, we would like to suggest that you should avoid some habits that you could have developed by now. Do not run after books, and more so new books and new material, at this stage. You have very little time at your disposal. See how much you absorb and do not estimate the number of books that have been read or consulted. Avoid as far as possible going to the libraries. Maybe you have to go to a library for the Encyclopaedia Britannica. Beyond that, we suggest that you keep away from libraries. Again we repeat: you have no time. And please do not be carried away by the vague suggestions or profound observations that people are very charitable in passing on to others without even asking for them. Trust in what is being said here and do make the best use of the material. And you must also keep cool and be confident. These two qualities would go a long way in contributing to the success of any examinee in any examination.

Regarding the critical approach to your answers, you must realise that the happenings associated with the theme on which you are attempting a question is always linked with both what preceded them and what followed them. Such an approach should give you two critical angles. Secondly, any theme in history is inter-linked with other themes of the same time period. This should give you the third critical angle. Thirdly, in every theme you find some points to be more important than other points. This way of focusing the attention of the examiners on the more important points should give you one more critical angle. In this way you can easily introduce four critical angles while answering questions on history.

NATURE OF QUESTIONS

The way in which the examiners have been setting questions is not satisfactory. The syllabus is very vast, but the examiners, at times, have been repeating questions from one year to the next. Secondly, compulsory questions on not very important themes were set in the examination. One finds fault with this practice because the syllabus by itself is far too exhaustive. Thirdly, two new trends have emerged from 1981 onwards. While asking candidates to attempt some questions which have been made compulsory, the examiner clearly specified the word-limit for answering each of the questions. Such an instruction must be carefully watched by the student. You can fall short of the word-limit prescribed, but you should never exceed. The other thing was limiting the choice of questions by reducing the total number of questions as compared ^{to} ~~the~~ two preceding years of 1979 and 1980.

HOW TO READ THE MATERIAL?

As already mentioned in the previous pages, the material before you covers every item or theme mentioned in the syllabus for both the Papers. Before choosing to read any one segment of the material, it is expected of you that you have already read some book of your own choice. Such a reading would enable you to appreciate better the value of the material. And while reading the material, you must make your own points, and that too in your own English, so that you can very easily remember on the day of the Examination what you had read in the material.

One warning here: do not anticipate any questions. You have no choice but to know something about every item or theme that is mentioned in the syllabus. We have already mentioned earlier that the examiners are tending to repeat questions and also pick up a little out-of-the-way themes or topics for the compulsory questions.

In the end, we would like to suggest that you should avoid some habits that you could have developed by now. Do not run after books, and more so new books and new material, at this stage. You have very little time at your disposal. See how much you absorb and do not estimate the number of books that have been read or consulted. Avoid as far as possible going to the libraries. Maybe you have to go to a library for the Encyclopaedia Britannica. Beyond that, we suggest that you keep away from libraries. Again we repeat: you have no time. And please do not be carried away by the vague suggestions or profound observations that people are very charitable in passing on to others without even asking for them. Trust in what is being said here and do make the best use of the material. And you must also keep cool and be confident. These two qualities would go a long way in contributing to the success of any examinee in any examination.

OVERVIEW OF WORLD HISTORY

World history began with navigation charts based on the knowledge of the Pole Star and the other inventions of man, like mariners' compass, astrolab and telescope and almost came to an end with the dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945. Beginning from the 15th century onwards, Europe went through a series of transformations which reached a culmination by the mid-19th century; and from 1870 onwards a few nations of Europe, and a little later the U.S., spread their tentacles all over the world causing convulsions as well as cataclysmic changes in the rest of the world. The drift of all these trends is the bringing together of all the peoples of the world closer and closer making institutions, values and ideas increasingly one and the same all over the world.

Such being the nature of modern world history, an identification of the forces and the factors that caused this transformation in the story of man would enable any reader to understand the spirit of world history. The first and the foremost force and factor was capitalism.

The changes that came in the trading and commercial activities of Europe from the 15th century onwards were backed by nascent capitalism to begin with. The explorations, the conquests and adventures of sea-faring people had cast the first dragnet over the world.

As more and more wealth came to some European nations, new institutional frameworks came into existence like banking, insurance, speculation, joint stock, and national and multi-national markets. These changes sparked off changes in the agricultural patterns of some of the countries of Europe making both agriculture and industrial activities interact. This interaction led to

accumulation of more wealth, changes in the process of production known as industrialization, application of scientific principles in the production of goods known as technological changes, and the factory system leading to industrialization by the mid-19th century. From this period onwards the capitalist economies were confronted with the problems of finding markets for their products as well as finding raw materials for their factories. Impelled by these forces, some of the nations went ahead with colonization of various parts of the world.

For the time being, keeping aside the consequences that flowed out of the colonial ventures of some European nations, we should here take note of the problems that were posed by mature capitalism. After all, life is a salesman. Everything man has, is at a price. The problems and challenges that were faced by the capitalist countries were both domestic as well as foreign. Internally all the capitalist countries faced the problem of growing labour discontent, proliferation of slums and innumerable problems. When these problems came to be tackled, it led to almost a total transformation of their social structure. As an answer to this problem, Britain evolved liberalism, and in a modified manner the same liberalism was accepted by the other capitalist countries too. But the socialist thinkers questioned the whole capitalist set-up and wanted a complete re-structuring of the economic order so that a better society can be ushered. The socialist answer has not been conceded, except in an indirect fashion in Britain. But the same thinking proved cataclysmic in Czarist Russia in 1917. After the institutionalization of socialism in Russia and its later acceptance in countries like China, Cuba and East European countries after the Second World War, an entirely new group of nations came into existence cherishing new values and nurturing new institutions and systems.

But the problems faced by the capitalist system in international affairs became more menacing. The scramble for colonies which was motivated by the desire to possess new markets and more and more of raw material led to a number of clashes which ultimately precipitated in the First World War. Indeed it is argued that national ambitions or prestige ^{was} more at the root of the clashes resulting in the First World War. One need not subscribe to this view. There is the other side of this coin. What is known as national power, prestige or ambition, is itself sustained by the ongoing economic transformation. Without capitalism and without industrialization backed by applied science or technology, there would have been no such phenomenon as aggressive national power or prestige. Had there been no support of capitalism-cum-industrialization the western powers would have never fought with each other -- either the First World War, and for that matter even the Second World War.

Now to take up the impact of West over the rest of the world, which was primarily raised on the pillars of capitalism and industrialism, the one immediate consequence was the humiliation and disparagement of all non-European civilizations like the Inca and the Mayan to begin with and later Indian, Chinese and Egyptian. Such being the nature of western colonialism or imperialism it naturally made the subject peoples of the world develop patriotic or national sentiments. As the irony of life would have it, the same process led to the induction of new values like liberty and nationalism and also the new economic institutional set-up of capitalism. In other words, the subject peoples of the world were willy-nilly drawn into the world socio-economic nexus initiated and propelled by capitalism, industrialization, finance capitalism and imperialism.

.../

Although capitalism and its progeny played the most crucial role in determining the destiny of modern world history, a few more forces constantly interacted with these developments in modern times. In the very early stages capitalism required freedom. This particular idea received an impetus by the resurrection of Greek heritage called Renaissance. The cardinal principle of Greek heritage is the rational individual who carries destiny in his own hands. The ambition of such an individual has no limits and it could only be cut down by Fate. This ethos of Greek heritage contributed to two movements in Europe known as Renaissance and Reformation. The former popularized secularist view; whereas, the latter broke the shackles of religion while liberating man. It was this liberated man who was instrumental for all the early efforts of the 16th and 17th century which proved beneficial to capitalism. And with the growing momentum of capitalism and capitalist countries, intellectuals demanded liberty, rights and ultimately democratic institutions as exemplified by liberalism in Europe.

These new ideas or social values came to be conceded in some parts of Europe over a period of time. In some areas of Europe these hopes were frustrated leading to social and political convulsions. The self same values came to be imbibed by the subject peoples of the colonial powers leading to national movements and national transformations all over the world.

Along with these two forces and factors, one more force interacted with them from the 16th century onwards. Countries like Britain, Spain, Portugal, Holland and a little later France, derived the maximum benefits from the new trading and commercial activities known as mercantilism. Both these activities brought different parts of the countries together, as well as giving a

.../

direction to be followed in the future. Such a development encouraged the sentiment of belonging together, the other expression for it being nationalism. It is this national spirit that spread to the rest of the world after the end of the Napoleonic era. Consequently, the political and social ambitions of the central as well as the eastern parts of Europe were at once national and liberal. After the central powers like Germany and Italy became national States, they started entertaining colonial and imperialistic ambitions. In the rest of eastern Europe the aspirations were only national and liberal. The interaction of these forces, that is, colonial, nationalist and liberal, precipitated the First World War. Since these aspirations were not properly satisfied even after the global war, Europeans went through one more period of heightened tension ending in the Second World War.

Before we proceed on to the problems and the challenges that face us for tomorrows to come, a brief reference to science and technology is a must, which was hinted at even in the first paragraph. From the beginning of the 16th century, encouraged by the spirit of inquisitiveness and individualism and as nurtured by the two movements of Renaissance and Reformation, thinking men of the West developed more and more of secular and rationalistic approaches towards life around. To begin with, such probings led to the development of instruments like mariners' compass, navigation charts, telescope and so on, apart from calling the attention of man to a new perspective of earth and planets and the Sun around. From the 17th century onwards, the nascent spirit of science came to be institutionalized as witnessed by the founding of the Royal Society in England. Boyle and Newton made the greatest contribution to science. In the 18th century

.../

it gathered more momentum leading to more researches in pure science and more application of scientific knowledge to practical purposes as evidenced by the application of steam, smelting process and so on. These developments directly influenced the processes of production, which, in turn, led to institutionalization of capitalism as evidenced by the factory system, industrialization and finance capital.

What began in the 18th century and early 19th century is being continued till today. In other words, from the 19th century onwards science and technology served the new structures and systems that came into existence in the wake of modern developments in Europe, for example, the question of national prestige and national power in the ultimate analysis being based on what scientific and technological innovations have provided for the nations.

Such have been the developments till today. However, even today, it is difficult to say, leaving aside the enormous benefits that accrued to Europe first and then to the rest of the world, that the problems created and the challenges posed by the factors and powers of the modern world have been satisfactorily answered. Colonialism appears in the form of neo-colonialism. Capitalist and non-capitalist stances appear in the form of ideological tensions.

What has gone wrong? It is the failure of man. It is somehow innate to man's nature to think in terms of one's own life span and then attempt answers to the problems and the challenges that one faces. Indeed a few of them are resolved, provided they satisfy the leading nations and the establishments in each of the nations while leaving the unsolved ones to the coming generations. Can man afford to look at life from such a limited focus of time? What any man today is because of the ages that preceded him; and what mankind would be tomorrow, would be determined by what man today is. Until and unless

...../

statesmen, military leaders and thinking individuals abandon the short-term view of life and accept the timeless view of life, the problems and challenges that man faces cannot be resolved satisfactorily. Unless man concedes the fact that he is a nonentity and that he is a minute speck in the seamless web of life and time continuum, the problems and challenges of mankind, including those of the modern world, cannot be resolved satisfactorily. After all, "the death of any man diminishes me."

In brief, if history has to change and if it has to become more and more meaningful, the perspective of man in viewing human life and its destiny should be completely metamorphosed.

ROLE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY IN WORLD HISTORY

The role of science and technology in the history of the world was experienced on two planes. The thinking of science was felt first by the intellectuals and the intelligentsia of Europe and then the rest of the world. But the consequence of technology on the ideas of man was experienced by a few individuals.

At the second level, the importance of technology was far more than that of science. The concrete manifestation of the consequence of technology was the rapid changes that the industrial organization of the world witnessed from the beginning of the 19th century onwards. One might even say that industrialization was the concrete manifestation of the application of science or technology.

What is known as science and technology in the context of world history was felt from the mid-18th century onwards. Prior to this period, machines were known to man like plough, compass, thermometer, air-pump, printing press, spinning wheel, etc. The field of pure science, too, was developed. With Galileo, optical glasses and telescopes came into existence. It was in 1687 that Newton published his Principle. About the same time, Boyle formulated his famous laws on gases and distinguished between organic elements and organic compounds. These developments, to some extent, did influence human speculation as well as their life for better. Paying tribute to Newton, a poet said that in the beginning God said Newton be and thus all was light. The compass, the telescope and the developments in mathematics were helpful to navigators and thus helped the developments in commerce and trade. At the back of this commercial activity were the merchant ships and the naval ships. All these

developments contributed to the linking of Europe with the rest of the world, either in the form of trade relations or establishment of colonies. Spain established the first colonial empire. Soon, the Dutch, the Portuguese, the English and the French joined the race. This led to the establishment of European conquest of Central America, the west coast of Africa, India and the East Indies. These developments could have ended at this point, but they got linked with one more development in the 18th century leading to far reaching changes.

The consequences of science and technology effected world history from the time Britain raced ahead in industrial revolution. From mid-18th century onwards, to begin with, her textile industry underwent a transformation. Hargreaves invented a machine to speed up spinning. Arkwright made these machines run with the help of water. Crompton combined both these inventions thereby making English cloth finer and cheaper than that of others.

One snag, however, was faced by the industrialists. Enough cotton was not available to feed these new machines. Thus, in 1783 the invention of cotton gin by Whitney completed the changes -- his machine separated seeds from cotton 300 times faster than by hand.

By 1800 England was on the crest of the wave of industrialization. England in the 18th century had outwitted Holland and France in America as well as India, although France partly succeeded during the second half of the 19th century. Here, it is of interest to note that the economic policy which Britain developed helped her successfully to pursue her trade and colonization. One of the principal reasons for the American War of Independence was the mercantilist exploitation of the 13 American colonies by England.

By the end of the 18th century a few more developments occurred in science and technology which has a direct bearing on industrialization. Lavoisier, who was hanged by the French peasants during the French Revolution, was the father of organic industry. By then, the knowledge of science regarding electricity grew from experiment to experiment. In this context the wellknown experiment of Benjamin Franklin was an important landmark. Besides, it was in 1814 that Stevenson made use of the steam engine to haul coal from mines to port. Transport of goods became quicker from now onwards. The rapid movement of goods was facilitated by a few earlier developments like the metalled roads of Macadam and the canals of Bridgewater in England during the second half of the 18th century.

But in early 19th century England and the rest of Europe could not make any headway in the industrial field because of the French revolutionary and Napoleonic wars. By the time the war clouds had disappeared, momentous developments occurred in the field of science and technology. It was, therefore, only after 1850 that the knowledge of science came to be rapidly applied to both economic as well as the everyday life of the people; and by the end of the 19th century the impact of science and technology grew into phenomenal proportions.

In the 20th century, the role of science and technology has been far too momentous. The latter has been so transforming the processes of production that industrial revolution is in the form of an exponential curve. The products of this technological revolution have almost touched every facet of man's life, personal, political, economic, social and cultural. In other words, in the second half of the 20th century we are confronted with

the gigantic task of making technology serve the needs
of man. The present indications are that man himself is
becoming the means for technology instead of the situation
being vice versa. Added to this, the temper or the
attitude that is promoted by science is not significant,
instead outdated sensibilities, ideas and perspectives
continue to influence man's thinking and actions.

HISTORY: PAPER II

SECTION B - SUB-SECTION A

INTRODUCING MERCANTILISM

The overseas expansion of Europe, the rise of capitalism, the emergence of national states and Mercantilism, or commercial revolutions, all had a simultaneous growth from the 16th century onwards. Each influenced every other factor in moulding modern Western Europe, characterized by mature capitalism or finance capitalism, agricultural, industrial and technological revolutions, national states professing democratic values along with their counterpoise in the form of either socialism or Fascism, and various other things. In other words, what was known as Mercantilism or commercial revolution cannot be viewed in isolation.

The spirit of curiosity that helped Renaissance, effecting developments in literature, science, government and religion, also led to the discovery of new lands. The primary motive behind these ventures was the profits that trade would bring in their wake - one of the aims of Mercantilism. The desire to explore the rest of the world for trade contacts was partly because of the tales circulated by travellers like Marco Polo (his travels in the 13th century) and partly the crusades which created interest in the East. Just at that time the fall of Constantinople made Europeans think of a different route for securing the goods from the East. Impelled by this necessity the voyagers set about the oceans exploring new lands and civilizations. Wherever the explorers went, the flag of their nations and their missionaries also followed. In a way, Mercantilism was motivated by three urges: gold, glory and god.

The explorers were followed by conquerors to the Americas. The conquered people in Central America were forced to perform hard labour, and if they resisted they

were massacred. The first conquerors of Americas were Spain and Portugal, to be soon followed by the English, the French and the Dutch. One of the evil consequences of these explorations and colonization was the trade in human beings, or the slave-trade.

It was this increase in trade and commerce that followed explorations and conquests which brought prosperity to Europe. Even by 1600 the amount of gold in Europe had doubled and silver increased by 10 times. Every country aimed to increase its gold stock. The theory of Mercantilism justified this urge. To acquire wealth a country should export maximum of goods and restrict imports to the bare minimum. In the beginning the traders purchased goods in Asia, sold them in European markets, and brought back gold to their respective countries. Later, when colonies were established in Asia and America the colonies were prohibited from trading with countries other than their mother countries. Mercantilism also imposed restrictions on the manufacture of goods in colonies in order to inhibit them from competing with the goods manufactured in the mother countries.

These explorations, colonies and trade and commerce ushered far-reaching changes. International trade shifted from the Italian cities to the countries that face the Atlantic. Accumulation of wealth by individuals facilitated the formation of big companies for extensive overseas trade, that is, capitalist production of goods. The trading companies enjoyed political influence and in many cases the rulers also held shares.

As trade grew and as the economic activity increased, a social change came in the form of the emergence of the middle class. The men of this class purchased lands which formerly belonged to the Church. Backed by wealth, the middle class played a leading role in getting rid of feudalism first,

and later absolute monarchies. Thus, almost unknowingly, the countries of Europe trekked on the path for a new social and economic system.

The new system of society which started emerging from the 15th century onwards is known as capitalism. Under this system goods were produced for sale in the market with the sole object of making profit. As the capitalists happened to be frugal, the economic tempo increased. In a way, the other side of the coin of Mercantilism was capitalism. Both combined together led to finance capitalism and imperialism.

Underpinning these developments was the industrial revolution with which began the machine age from the mid-18th century onwards. The earlier domestic system became obsolete and the factory system came into existence after 1750. In place of simple tools and the use of animal and manual power, steam power and machines came to be increasingly used. All the facilities for production were owned and managed by the capitalists. It was the factory system that was at the base of the industrial revolution. This revolution received further momentum from the mid-19th century onwards when science came to be rapidly applied for changing the modes of production. Then onwards the industrial revolution has been going at such a tremendous speed that in the 20th century it has come to be known as the technological revolution.

In brief, what was known as Mercantilism or the commercial revolution was only one dimension of the complex of changes that emerged clearly in early 16th century.

NATURE AND THOUGHT OF MERCANTILISM

Mercantilism, so christened in the 18th century, is really a facet of an omnibus movement which came to lime-light in the 16th century. The other facets of Mercantilism were overseas expansion of Europe, rise of capitalism and factory system, Renaissance and Reformation, and emergence of national states.

Mercantilism varied in every country, according to local conditions and traditions; yet it can be said in a general way that it was the economic counterpart of the political processes by which the national states were emerging.

From one point of view mercantilism was the effort to secure economic unity. The administrators of the new states were anxious to wipe out the old variations in coinage, in weights and measures, and in taxation. They wished to remove the customs barriers and city tolls that had grown up within the nations.

From the second point of view, mercantilism was economic etatisme or the search for control. The national governments sought to take over the economic functions formerly carried on by the Church, the town, the province, the feudal lord, and the guild.

From the third point of view, mercantilism was the search for power. Each national State wanted to make itself strong and prosperous. Each State wished to build up its industry and agriculture and to extend its commerce. Each state strove to gain wealth at the expense of other states and to win colonies overseas.

Above all, it was closely linked to the rise of capitalism and to the expansion of Europe. It was the increase of capitalistic business that turned the attention

of people to economic matters as the key to wealth and power. In a general way, however, mercantilism helped the capitalist by putting the power of the State behind him, even though it hampered and restricted him at the same time.

No country adopted and applied all the mercantilist notions at the same time. In fact, each nation had its own brand of mercantilism distinct and different from the rest. In Portugal mercantilism centered at first on spice trade. In Spain it was based in large part on the possession of the American colonies. In Holland the major questions were shipping, commerce, and the carrying trade. England built up, first, a mercantilism associated with industry and internal administration and then turned (after 1660) to a type of mercantilism that was almost purely commercial and colonial. France slowly built up a well-rounded mercantilist tradition that reached full development only after 1661, when attention was paid to industry, commerce and colonies.

One of the basic tenets of mercantilism was bullionism, or the belief that the way for a country to get rich and powerful was to acquire and keep as much gold and silver as possible. Under the influence of rising capitalism the medieval idea that money is sterile was slowly abandoned. As early as the fourteenth century in Italy, writers began to repeat the classical saying, "Money is the sinews of war", since it became evident that with money a city could buy arms, soldiers, and ships.

The bullionists were not simple-minded. They knew that money itself could not be eaten or used for clothes, or housing. Few of them were so naive as to think that gold and silver were the only forms of wealth. But many of them did hold that money was the most usable, the most important, the most universal form of wealth. Though most of the mercantilist nations were thus connected with bullionism, few writers or statesmen attempted to work out a logical series of policies

based on the attempt to increase a nation's supply of gold and silver.

Another tenet of Mercantilists was to secure a favourable balance of trade or of payments, mercantilists advocated import and export duties, the encouragement of industry, agriculture and mines, a large merchant marine, and acquisition of colonies.

Apart from the above tenets, Mercantilism was associated with fourteen more trends.

(a) Self-sufficiency. Each nation to produce all that it used, and if possible to have a surplus to sell abroad. It was felt to be shameful and harmful to depend for anything, especially for the necessities of life, /a /on foreign country.

(b) Industry. To be self-sufficient, a nation produced every kind of manufactured goods that it needed. If it had an industry, it nurtured and encouraged it.

(c) Mines. If a country had minerals, it discovered and developed them to increase its self-sufficiency and provide its industries with raw materials.

(d) Agriculture. Similarly a country fostered and developed its agriculture so that it would not be dependent on foreigners for food or raw materials, but it would provide its industries with materials like wool, flax, silk, and hemp.

(e) Commerce. Self-sufficiency helped but little if a country was without commerce, since only through an extensive foreign trade would nations sell surplus products abroad and bring back gold and silver. Commerce, therefore was aided and extended in every way. Merchants were protected abroad, favourable treaties negotiated, new markets opened up.

In general, while tariffs were high on the importation of manufactured goods and the exportation of raw materials, they were low on the importation of raw materials and the exportation of manufactured goods.

(f) Sea Power. To get its goods to foreign markets, nations maintained a large number of merchant ships.

(g) Colonies. Colonies were important in a number of ways. They provided an additional market for a nation's manufactures. They supplied valuable raw materials² that could not be produced at home. Colonial trade could keep busy a great portion of the marine population³. A large colonial population was an additional source of manpower⁴. Colonies gave bases for the extension of trade⁵. They added to a country's prestige⁶ and to its weight in world affairs.

(h) Population. Nearly all the other points depended on a large and industrious population. Men were needed to labour in the fields and the mines, to work in the manufactures and on the ships, to provide soldiers and sailors, and to people the colonies.

Some writers and statesmen (specially English ones) thought that the working population should be ill-paid in order to keep it hard at work and reduce the cost of goods so that they might compete in foreign markets.

(i) The Poor. There was a general feeling that able-bodied paupers should be put to useful work, especially in manufactures of some sort. It was thought that vagabonds, sturdy beggars, gypsies, and other poor people who wandered about were often idle by inclination.

(j) Luxury. In addition to these notions the mercantilists emphasized the fact that many luxury goods, since they were imported from abroad, took money out of the country. Some advocated doing without luxuries; while others wished to have them produced at home so far as that was possible.

(k) Foreigners. Mercantilism fostered distrust of foreigners which had come down from the middle ages and it was accentuated by the grasping Italian bankers of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

(l) Unity. It was believed that the application of mercantilist policies would bring together the interests of all in the country and make a real economic unit of it.

(m) State Action. To accomplish their many and various ends almost all mercantilists believed in action by the national state. In one field they might disapprove of state action, but in others they would urge it earnestly. Was anything wrong? The state could cure it. Was anything to be done? The state should do it or at least assist its accomplishment. Though most business was left in private hands, it was even felt that private initiative could best be stimulated by rewards and favours from the state.

FACTORS/FORCES PROMOTING MERCANTILISM

1. Need for goods - fondness for exotic and rare articles popularised by crusaders and story-tellers like Marco Polo.
2. Merchant guilds of the medieval ages provided the organisational set-up. Later came the craft guilds which improved the quality of goods leading to bigger and more markets. At this juncture emerged capitalists as bolstered by the banking system.
3. From the 15th century onwards cash transactions and the banking system rapidly developed.
4. From the late 15th century onwards geographical exploration facilitated by mariner's compass, the astrolab (an Arab contribution) and cartographic chart, developed navigation.

5. Royal patronage - Henry of Portugal was called Henry the Navigator and Henry VIII of England designed ships. Monarchs found their alliance with the merchants and the middle class advantageous to outwit the barons and the feudal order.

6. More than that they provided them wealth and wealth is power and power is the primary need of monarchs, or for that matter any ruler.

7. While the power of the monarchs grew, people became nationalist in outlook. This nationalist fervour gave a thrust first to Mercantilist activities and later to nationalist and chauvinist wars.

8. The 15th and 16th centuries witnessed the rise of Protestantism (Reformation) as well as a new sect to spread Christianity as pioneered by Jesuits.

9. An elemental force was unleashed in the fifteenth century and it was the Greek heritage (known ^{as} Renaissance) - the gods in the Greek pantheon sported and frolicked with human beings and they feared only Fate. This attitude towards life made the Greek people believe that man could carry destiny in his own hands. That was how when the Greek learning was revived, the outlook of Europe was changed. Influenced by the impassioned spirit of Greek individualism, Europeans undertook breath-taking discovery of continents and oceans, conquered unknown nations and faced unknown challenges.

Also, this Greek heritage manifested itself in the form of Faustian urge. whoever was impelled by it, willingly sold his soul to the Devil since such an individual always had a mighty ambition to be fulfilled. Tamerlane, a character in a play, suspects that gods were jealous of his health since his conquest of the world was not complete. In this context he boasted that he would slaughter the gods and set black

streamers on the firmament. ✓ It was this daredevil individualism that was the real prime-mover behind modern Europe in the early period, and therefore, the driving force behind Mercantilism was the individualism of the Greeks.

10. Scientific developments of the day too enabled the adventurous men of Europe to venture on overseas trade. Galileo's telescope, in the beginning, was used for watching the coming of merchant ships into the ports.

FEATURES OF MATURE MERCANTILISM

Along with capitalist farming emerged structural changes in society. Some of the men who were able to free themselves from the feudal structure moved over to the craft guilds and the new towns that emerged.

The story was like this. All the new towns and the famous cities like Venice, Florence, Pisa, Antwerp, London and Seville developed new characteristics. The common denominator in the new towns/cities was almost total freedom from the rest of the country. It was in these cities that banking system grew since they financed the overseas trade of European nations. This free atmosphere of cities resulting in the widening of human horizons had a remarkable influence on liberating the human mind. Towering personalities like Machiavelli, Michelangelo, Leonardo da Vinci and Galileo appeared in the Italian

...../-

city-states. London hummed with literary activity which finally culminated in Shakespeare.

The trade and commerce that was developed by the cities during the century was first taken advantage of by Portugal and Spain. Seeing the developments in the late 15th century, the Pope by a stroke of his pen, divided the whole world into two parts and assigned the East to Portugal and the West to Spain. The Portuguese primarily aimed at commerce while the Spanish went ahead with colonization. The latter destroyed the great civilizations of the Mayans and Incas. Although the two countries led European expansion into the world, they received a setback by the end of the 16th century. Portugal was united with Spain in 1580 and Spain was knocked out by Britain in 1588. The Spanish threat appeared ominous to the contemporaries till the mid-17th century, but it proved to be an illusion.

Why Portugal and Spain failed to take the lead was partly because of religion. Catholic religion inhibited the release of human potentialities; whereas, protestantism liberated them. It was this spirit of individualism that contributed to the British victory over the Spanish Armada. Since individual initiative did not emerge in Spain and Portugal, capitalism did not develop there. On the other hand, since some areas of Germany and Britain came under the influence of the Puritan or the Calvinist religions, the peoples of these regions contributed to the emergence of capitalism. The Protestants (Puritans and Calvinists) reinterpreted the Biblical ban on usury by saying that interest is totally different from usury. Moreover, as the banking industry developed in Holland, Germany and Britain, the wealth that Spain and Portugal accumulated was freely transferred to other countries through the banking industry. Banks can provide finances as well as stand-guarantee for commercial transactions: the banks

could provide such facilities by attracting precious metal from Portugal and Spain. In brief, the absence of Protestantism and the banking system throttled the Portuguese and Spanish expansion in the world.

Indeed there are a few exceptions to it. Spain established colonies in the Latin American hemisphere which survived till the Munro Doctrine. The Portuguese succeeded in establishing themselves in Brazil but it too, left in 1827. Yet both of them acquired colonies in Africa which continued till recent times.

Mercantilism thus constituted the superstructure while the socio-economic changes that occurred in Europe during the 15th and 16th centuries constituted the sub-structure. The colonization and exploitation of non-European areas was one of the projections of the superstructure.

The developments in the sub-structure led to interesting developments within Europe. Trade and commerce require linkage of countries. To begin with, each trading country developed into one network. In England the cottage supplied the yarn, the town manufactured the cloth, the port exported it, and London controlled the financial strings. A historian remarked that the pack of mules and horses laden with cloth bales moved like shuttles across the warp and woof of Britain. This cloth was exported through Antwerp to various parts of Europe. Another historian remarked that the coat worn by a Hungarian nobleman could be traced back to the fleece on the back of an English sheep. The commercial and trading activity drawing all the parts of a country into one network promoted national sentiment: Spain was the first; England, the second; Holland, the third; and France, the fourth. Indeed the rise of national sentiment

was partly facilitated by rivalries between nations for getting the maximum share in the booming trade and commerce.

These developments in Europe led to one more development or transformation. The kings - Henry VII, Henry VIII and Elizabeth in England, Henry the Navigator of Portugal, Charles-V of Spain, Louise X of France - sided with rising commercial and merchant classes leading to the emergence of strong monarchies. Such a transformation of the political structure meant the death-knell of feudalism. Aided by the accumulating wealth and some developments in science (compass, astrolab, telescope and gun-powder) the new monarchs of Europe brought down the feudal castles.

By the end of the 16th century the stage was set for the famous mercantilist wars of the future. In early 17th century, the British immigrants established colonies on the western seaboard of America. These settlements were followed by those of the French along the Mississippi river and the Great Lakes. This stage setting was the principal cause of the Austrian Succession and Seven Years Wars in 18th-century Europe. Prior to this, because of the Spanish Succession war, British primacy was established in Europe after the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713. In appearance the wars of the 17th and 18th centuries were fought for certain ostensible reasons while the prime-mover was the clash of mercantilist interests.

Apart from this, the emergence of merchant trading community led to a political revolution in Britain making the king a nominal head and thus preparing the ground for the emergence of democracy in England. Such is the tenuous link between mercantilism and the evolution of democracy, an institution which later spread to all parts of the world. One other consequence of the mercantilist movement was the birth of capitalism, which,

in turn, led to liberalism. The early thinkers of liberalism defended right to vote, freedom of speech, religion etc. and limited government in the name of liberty although their principal demands were right to property and free enterprise. This liberal philosophy influenced the history of Europe all through the capitalist era. In other words, liberalism became the camouflage or an apology for capitalist exploitation. While liberalism supported the capitalist system, the latter helped colonialism and imperialism.

By the end of the century a new dimension was added to the mercantilist activity which heralded the later-day social conflict of racism. The Spaniards saw ^{that} slavery existed in the ancient civilizations of Latin America. Later, they realized that Africans could be traded as slaves. This knowledge made both Spain and Britain to sell goods in West Africa and get slaves in return. These slaves were transported across the Atlantic under the most inhuman conditions. After the slaves were taken out from the holds of the ships, they were generously sprinkled with sulphur powder so that they should be acceptable to the future slave-masters. The African slaves were sold in the West Indies and in the 17th century to the British colonies of Florida and Virginia.

One of the consequences of the inhuman trade was the American Civil War of the 19th century and in the 20th century the Panther Movement and the Civil Right Movement of Martin Luther King. Later, European colonies once again revived slave trade when they enticed and enslaved Chinese people and sold them as slaves in South Africa - one of the causes of the bitterness of the Chinese against Western penetration.

Another revealing feature of this mercantilist expansion was the role played by religion. In the 16th

century, the Jesuit priests took the lead to spread the message of Jesus; but the Bible and the sword are not a good combination. This fact was partly responsible for the failure of the Portuguese in the East and the inability of the Spaniards to continue their lead in colonization.

In brief, mercantilism reached a watershed in the 16th century and the consequences of mercantilism, ranging from individual freedom to the sanctity of private property, constitute the crucial chunk of the prominent factors determining today's world.

CRITIQUE OF MERCANTILISM

Mercantilism is the name given to the ideas and thinking that governed international trade of the West from the mid-15th to mid-18th centuries. The origins of the Mercantilist thought go back to a century beyond the mid-15th; and Mercantilism as a policy ended by the mid-19th century. The men who expounded on Mercantilism were civil servants, statesmen and financial and business leaders of the period. This thinking to begin with, governed the external trade of France, England and Italy leading to substantial results. It was equally accepted in Scotland, Spain and Russia although the consequences of pursuing such a policy by them had a very marginal influence on the then Europe as well as the succeeding ages.

Amongst the thinkers who suggested ideas and corrections to this particular pattern of trade, the

first was de Montechretin. While supporting the principle that exports should far outweigh imports, he championed national chauvinism. This slant in the thinking of this thinker later appears in the form of colonial rivalries and mercantilists wars in the 17th and 18th centuries. Apart from this idea, this thinker was instrumental for popularizing the idea that men reduced to do nothing are easily induced by the devil, and idleness corrupts the vigour of men and the chastity of women. This idea influenced the later-day Protestant or Calvinistic ethic.

The second thinker, Malynes, showed that outflow of precious metals could lead to a fall in prices at home and a rise in prices abroad. He argued that exchange control should be used to improve the terms of trade for U.K. This was an important clarification of the economic thought of the day: this idea later on gave rise to the quantity theory of money.

The third thinker was Mun, who was a director of the East India Company. He argued against export of bullion and other restrictions pointing out that such restrictions on trade invited retaliatory measures in foreign countries. In his view one can detect the later-day free-trade principle. He also argued that export surplus should be sought in England's balance of trade as a whole but it was unnecessary to achieve this with each trading partner. This was a sensible idea but there were no takers at that time. Even then, he laid down the dictum: to sell more to strangers easily than we consume theirs in value, is wisdom.

The last of the important contributors was Misselden. He argued that international movements of species and fluctuations in the exchange rate depended on international trade flows and it was not due to the

Equally important developments occurred in Italy although it was not located on the Atlantic seaboard. The merchants and bankers of Italy thrived on the trade that passed through Asia Minor or modern West Asia leading to the growth of towns and ports, and some of them became famous free cities like Florence and Venice. The same development was witnessed to a lesser extent in Holland, France, England and Spain.

Since the social structure of people in the towns was different from the rest of the areas in the respective countries, new social forces came to be generated. According to some historians, London was more important than rest of the country in the 17th century as it was the London mob that gave the peculiar turns and twists to English history. The role played by the free cities of Italy was equally momentous. They took to games like tennis and chess and their whole style of life was different from that of the past as well as that of their compatriots. Some of the famous commercial houses of Italy were patrons of eminent artists like Raphael, Michelangelo and Leonardo da Vinci. Although Italy and the city-states of Italy acted as the radiating centres of capitalism in transforming the whole of Europe. Cities like Florence were pioneers in European efflorescence in fine arts. London played a crucial role in nursing literary activity. Shakespeare lived in an age of social turbulence. In both London and the Italian cities, the social transition that occurred because of decaying feudalism and emerging capitalism, had a tremendous bearing on the literary and artistic activities of Europe.

In this context, it is equally surprising that it was in Britain and Italy that major thrust towards scientific advances occurred. It was in the age of

trade and commerce that Francis Bacon lived and his method of science is known as 'The Method of Science'. Italy witnessed Galileo. Galileo first used his telescope to observe the incoming and outgoing merchant ships. The stock of Galileo went up. Later the telescope was turned towards the skies; and with that step the science of astronomy was born. Far more important is the fact that Galileo lived in the new cities of Italy and there conducted all his scientific experiments. According to Bertrand Russell, Galileo was the father of modern science since he was the first thinker to quantify scientific phenomena.

While Mercantilism was greatly instrumental for the social and intellectual climate of Europe, it was equally powerful in determining the foreign policies of European countries. It was Spain and Portugal that ventured out on the high seas to begin with. Their colonial ambitions were soon frustrated by Britain. Spain primarily concentrated on the American continent. Cortez, Pizarro and their followers were instrumental for the wiping out some of the ancient civilizations while filling the coffers of Spain and Portugal. Yet Spain could not take the lead in the geographical explorations and colonizations of Europe because the monarchical system was too arbitrary and did not permit the individual energies of the Spanish to venture out. Also, this failure of Spain was because of the dominance of Catholic faith, unlike England and Holland. The same handicap was a millstone around the neck of France since Protestants (rebellious religious groups) were very few - it could not avail of the opportunity that lay before the trans-Atlantic countries after the sea-voyages.

All through the period when the Mercantilist policy was followed, the state grew in power since traders and merchants found it advantageous to support a centralized

authority leading to the emergence of a new social class called the middle class. In England the middle class found itself constrained by absolute monarchy. The conflict between the King and the middle class led to a civil war leading to limited government which ultimately matured into democracy.

While Mercantilism caused a sea-change in domestic affairs, State to State relations amongst the leading countries as influenced by the Mercantilist policies led to colonial wars. As already remarked earlier, Britain outwitted country after country for primacy and emerged as the leading European power by the end of the 18th century.

Besides, Britain also witnessed internal changes in tune with the Mercantilist activities leading to representative government, liberty, equality and the other paraphernalia. And all the time the Mercantilist policies brought more and more wealth to Britain. Since other countries were neither wealthy nor free enough to give a free rein to individual initiative, Britain was the first country in the race for industrialization. From then onwards, the factory-owner became more important than the merchant and the trader. Thus, by the mid of the 19th century capitalists and factory-owners started influencing the States, but not merchants and traders. In other words, the Mercantilist thinking and practices contributed to the emergence of capitalism in Europe. Continental powers like Holland and France smuggled machinery to imitate the success of Britain. There is a strange irony in history. Mercantilism replaced feudalism, while generating capitalism; and later, capitalism was replaced by finance capital after 1870.

Apart from the aforesaid momentous changes in European history, all logically linked with Mercantilism,

the Mercantilist policies also initiated a chain of events which led to later-day imperialism. Britain was the first capitalist country. Soon enough France, Holland, Belgium and Germany joined the race. By the time these countries had their own capitalist systems, Britain, impelled by finance capital, established colonies. The late-comers found it difficult to carve out colonies for themselves in the world. For some time this scramble for colonies was satisfied when the leading powers took out the map of the world and marked on it their respective spheres of influence like the partitioning of Africa. The settlement did not satisfy the ego of the Germans. This led to the confrontation between the established colonial powers and the struggling colonial powers. Such was the First World War.

By then, nations seeking more markets spread their tentacles into Asia also, while India was already under the colonial rule of Britain. The Far East consisting of China and Japan, attracted the attention of capitalist European powers. In the beginning, Britain and later France and Germany established their own spheres of influence in China. The U.S., a late starter, stepped into the arena by proclaiming a seemingly innocuous doctrine of 'Open Door Policy'. The real intention of the colonizers was access to more and more markets for their expanding capitalist economies. These attempts convulsed China leading to various revolts like the Taiping, the Boxer, the Nationalist, and finally the communist revolution. Japan was shrewd enough in paying back the West by its own coin. Pretending to be toeing western culture, she too sought markets at the expense of China and thereby aggravated the internal convulsions of China that were already caused by the Western impact.

.../-

All told, the chain of events that Mercantilism led to in the world is almost unimaginable. Although its primary nature was exploitative we cannot brush aside the good it brought to the world. In the 16th and 17th centuries it brought the world together. Both in the 17th and 18th centuries European countries quarrelled over colonies, and a worsening of it in the 19th century led to the First World War. Nevertheless, during the same period, as the tempo of Mercantilism was accelerated, the world came to be influenced by the ideas and institutions of the West. The British unwittingly shifted her self-governing institutions first to the U.S. soon it spread to Canada and the other dominions and colonies of the British empire. The rest of the European powers were instrumental for causing traumatic shocks to the peoples in the world. In this process they were able to disseminate the ideas of rationality, liberty, and secularism all over the world. In brief, Mercantilism was the first phase (the later two being capitalism and finance capital) in the emergence of the world as one entity paying homage to some common ideas and values.

INTRODUCING CAPITALISM

Capitalism is more an ethos than an institution.

The hard core of the ethos of capitalism is money, which is the beginning and the end of the whole capital system. Money is gained through profits and profits are indicated by prices. A capitalist in seeking money or wealth treats it as an end by itself without bothering about the means. He even justifies it as a great morality or virtue. Indeed, different terms are used in attributing value to money like freedom, free market, free world and so on.

This ethos is sufficiently rooted or grounded, that is, it has an institutional counterpart. One dimension of this institution relates to money, banking currency, credit, bills of exchange, insurance, etc. The second dimension of it relates to contract, company, partnership, shares, joint-stock, monopoly, cartels, trusts and so on.

The ethos and the institutional framework of capitalism were promoted by certain factors like availability of capital, free and wide markets, technological know-how, right to private property, and presence of individual entrepreneurs. Initiated and propelled by these factors, capitalism, as normally understood, passed through three stages: commercial enterprises organised along capitalist lines called commercial capitalism or Mercantilism during 1500-1776; industrialization based on capitalism from 1776 to 1850; and after 1850 finance capitalism meaning joint-stock companies, investments abroad, etc. Some writers regard that the rise of capitalism went along three lines: growth of capitalist spirit, the accumulation of capital, and the development of capitalistic techniques or institutions.

A great number of developments from the 15th century onwards in Western Europe contributed for the emergence of this ethos and its concrete manifestation. The first

among them was Mercantilism. This policy favoured by nations highlighted the importance of individualism, trade, acquisition of colonies and bullion. All these features figure in capitalism also, but in a changed form. Individualism appears in the form of the possessive individual, or the egoism of the individual. In later period it grew into rational individual who makes a distinction between self-regarding and other-regarding activities while laying claim to inalienable rights and treating the State as a human contrivance catering to the requirements of individuals. ²The second one, trade, to begin with, appeared in the form of free trade as opposed to the protectionist policy changed into a hybrid, partly free trade and partly protectionist. Far more important was the change in the content of the commodities that were exchanged. In the Mercantilist era the precious metal and spices enriched a few European nations contributing to the establishment of strong monarchies supported by the emerging bourgeoisie; and in the capitalist era it helped the exchange of goods; and during the days of finance capital, apart from making the living of the upper strata of society affluent, liquid capital exported to the far-off colonies to acquire colonies. ³Regarding the third, that is acquisition of colonies, in the Mercantilist era some civilizations were wiped out and the invading soldiers and traders pillaged a few areas of the world to bring back home gold and silver. But in the early stages of the capitalist era colonies were treated as dumping grounds for the capitalist countries while imports from the colonies were subjected to increasing restrictions; and in the second phase of capitalism the metropolis or capitalist country pretended to do a service to the colonial area known as the imperialist ideologies of the second half of the 19th century. ⁴And finally the last consequence of Mercantilism, that is, bullion, underwent great

.../

transformation. In the beginning, currencies replaced precious metal in trading transactions. As trade grew both in volume and complexity, a number of institutions came to prop up the money transactions like banking, insurance, joint-stock companies, and so on.

This complex development around the four consequences of Mercantilism constituted the explicit appearance of capitalism. The implicit nature of capitalism was acquisitiveness or profit-making. Around this motive force a great amount of theoretical explanations were evolved like the virtues of market economy, the greatness of entrepreneurial skill and later managerial skill, the significance of accumulation of wealth (Protestant ethic of Weber), and so on.

Furthermore, as Capitalism grew and matured it influenced various developments of European nations. From the 16th century onwards it was realized that agricultural surplus, too, can be turned into money leading to investment of capital in agricultural occupations so that more and more money could be gained. In the industrial field, too, starting from the 16th century onwards, enterprising bourgeoisie found it profitable to invest money in bringing about changes in the means of production. The beginnings that were made from 16th century reached a watershed by the end of the 18th century. Even before the close of the century efforts were made to harness science for bringing about more changes in manufacturing activity. This resulted in ushering the age of technology a few decades before the close of the 19th century; and from the beginning of the 20th century the technological revolution has been proceeding in an exponential manner.

In the meantime, ^a great number of changes came in the social life of the people because of the emergence of factories, growth of urban areas, increase in population,

radical transformation to occupations and life styles and so on. As these developments went apace the structure of the State also underwent transformation. In the early stages strong monarchies were the norm, and from the 18th century onwards constitutional monarchies or democracies came into existence. By the close of the 19th century all these developments, including the mother of it, that is, capitalism, came under severe attack from socialist thinkers, the most important of them being Marx.

Confronted with this challenge the supporters of free market economy, capitalism or liberalism, shifted their sights. Such was the beginning of liberal social legislation in Britain and the social insurance scheme of Bismarck in the 19th century. These developments still appear today in the form of welfare or social security measures in almost all the free world countries.

In brief, capitalism has been both an important force and factor in contributing to the world as it is today. Some like ^{Milton} Friedman and the Chicago boys take pride with their short-lived experiment in Chile and they have won two leaders of importance, namely, Reagan and Mrs. Thatcher, to their new ideology which is nothing but capitalism in a new guise. On the other hand, extreme left still adheres to Marxist epitaph that although capitalism achieved more monumental things than the Roman aqueducts and the Gothic cathedrals of the past, it is destined to be relegated into the museum of antiquities along with the bronze axe and the spinning wheel.

ORIGINS OF CAPITALISM

Europe emerged as the dominant country of the world on the crest of the wave of capitalism. Its roots go back to medieval times while it matured in the 18th century. By the mid-19th century it transformed itself into finance capitalism. And from mid-19th century onwards it has come to be known by various names like capitalist and imperialist era, joint-stock capitalism, anonymous capitalism, corporate capitalism and even imperialism and neo-colonialism.

According to Hobson, capitalism is defined as the organization of business on a large scale by an employer or a company of employers possessing an accumulated stock of wealth wherewith to acquire raw materials and tools, and hire labour, so as to produce an increased quantity of wealth which shall constitute profit. The implications of this definition are the following: large-scale business employing the factory system and individual capitalist or joint stock capitalism, a sure supply of raw materials, availability of machinery, employees as sellers of labour, and an enormous increase in the profits of the entrepreneurs or capitalists.

All these features of capitalism emerged in the 18th century. But its origins go back to the later middle ages. By the beginning of the 16th century the manorial and the guild systems were on the decline. Proprietors of land instead of exacting services on demand from serfs and tenants, started receiving money from free tenants while hiring agricultural labourers. This spirit of gaining financial profits was approved by even Christian theologians. It was argued that interest was not the same as usury which is condemned in the Bible as a sin.

²The second important factor which contributed for the growth of capitalism and the capitalist spirit was the emergence of towns. The men who inhabited the towns were not the traditional guild leaders but ambitious persons (landlords, traders, nobles and officials of State and Church) who utilized their independence to amass private fortunes. As the cities grew, the value of the city land increased and the owners of land in the cities added unearned increments to their capital.

It was in the Italian cities that the banking system was first fashioned. The most famous banking family was the Medici. The coat of arms of the Medici (red balls and a field of gold) became the general insignia of money-lenders, the badge of new capitalism.

³The third factor in the development of capitalism was a non-European factor. Europe had no adequate output of gold or silver. Europe possessed no surplus population. Europe also did not possess natural resources. All these shortfalls were met by the new European contacts with Asia, Africa and America. All the ingredients that capitalists needed were acquired in a variety of ways: by military plunder (Mexico, Peru and the East Indies), by forced unequal trade with civilized peoples in India, China and Japan, and with primitive tribesmen in the new world, by the imposition of tax, tribute and trade restrictions of both natives and colonies overseas. The gains thus accruing were supplemented by the labour system, especially the one prevailing in America. The Portuguese and the Spanish explorers discovered the institution of slavery and they soon opted for the institution of slavery for the operation of mines and large plantations in the new world. The Spaniards and the Portuguese virtually enslaved the native Indians of the West Indies, Mexico, Peru and Brazil. Soon this habit spread. Blessed by a bishop, the King of Spain began the notorious slave trade of Negroes from Africa.

.../

4 The fourth factor was Mercantilism which accelerated the growth of capitalism: more precious metal from outside to help evolution of currency, banking and financial market; profitable commerce and trade; impetus to individual initiative and innovative temper; markets and colonies for exports and foreign investments; stimulus to the emergence of middle class; and giving a fillip to the capitalist virtue of amassing wealth.

Apart from these major factors contributing to capitalism, a few more things facilitated the accumulation of capital and the spread of the capitalist spirit: support of national monarchies in Europe, the Crusades, the geographical discoveries and voyages, and the scientific developments like mariner's compass, astrolab, the telescope and new methods of ship-building. The new capitalists were the proteges of kings and dukes and prelates. Members of nobility found it profitable, although a bit undignified, to make investments in manufacturing and trade. Very often poor noblemen, who needed money as well as wives, sought the hand of wealthy merchant's daughters.

Regarding the spread of capitalism, it is surprising to note that Spain and Portugal, although pioneers in overseas exploration, colonization, trade and slavery, could not become the leading capitalist countries. The home situation was such that capitalism could not grow in the two countries. The masses in both the nations devoted themselves totally to agriculture. Both the countries produced hardly enough to feed and clothe themselves. They had no money to supply to the needs of the colonies, nor exchange the money for oriental luxuries. The consequence was that the small minority, who went across the seas, sought the help of foreign bankers for the capitalist investments that were needed. The result was the wealth

of Spain and Portugal moved to foreigners like the Italian bankers and later the Dutch and German bankers.

Italian bankers financed early expeditions from Lisbon and Seville. But as the century advanced, the banking pre-eminence passed to the Germans and the Dutch. The reason for the decline of the Italian banking industry was the hostility of the Turks and the Ottoman conquest of the Asiatic Minor. Since the trade routes got disturbed, European merchants went to Lisbon and Seville for goods rather than to Venice or Geneva.

As the merchants and the bankers in Germany and the Netherlands were not harassed by the advancing Ottoman Turks they could develop their traditional trade with Russia, Scandinavia and England. Besides, they had at their disposal mineral resources of iron and copper which enabled them to improve and extend their manufactures. Also, they faced no risks since they themselves did not directly carry the overseas trade.

It was Antwerp that became the centre of banking business. To begin with, the Fuggers, a weaver family of Agusberg, made Antwerp their headquarters because of its favourable location, -- at the cross-roads of old and new trade routes. By the mid of the 16th century more than a thousand foreign merchants (German, Spanish, Portuguese, English, Danish and Italian) settled in Antwerp. It was at this town that many institutions of modern capitalism came to be developed. The first stock exchange was established in 1531. It was here that the practice of betting in the exchange grew. Lotteries flourished. Life insurance came into existence -- insurance of ships and cargo for the duration of a journey by land or by sea.

Regarding England, London became the financial centre. Interestingly, the Bankers' Street in London even now is known as Lombard Street since Lombardy was the place where the banking system originated -- money-lenders sat on bancos (benches) which later came to be known as banks. London grew as the capitalist centre in the 16th century primarily because of its cloth trade. Yarn was spun in the cottages; cloth was woven in boroughs or towns; cloth was exported from the ports; and London monopolized the financial strings of the booming cloth trade. "The long trains of pack-horses, each animal with a wool-sack or a bale of cloth hung across its back, were shuttles forever moving across the warp and woof of English life, drawing distant regions and classes together in a solid national texture."

DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM IN BRITAIN

It was in Britain that capitalism grew in three stages or on the lines that are mentioned in the topic "Introducing Capitalism".

From the mid-16th century onwards England witnessed a booming trade and commerce facilitated by cloth trade and changes in agriculture. There was sufficient interaction between agriculture and industry in the form of the enclosures of land in the 16th century -- while enclosures increased production of wool and created rural unemployment the urban areas absorbed the rural unemployed. This alliance was further augmented by a financial network -- rudimentary banking -- that developed with London as its hub. This initiative of Britain received encouragement

By the end of the 17th century, the factors that helped the growth of capitalism gained momentum leading to the next phase, that is, organization of industry on capitalist lines, without any mishap or misdirection. The markets of England expanded since Britain, starting from the 17th century and ending with 1713, defeated her colonial and commercial competitors (Mercantilist competitors), they being Spain, Holland and France.

And in the 18th century the individual initiative that appeared in the 16th century transformed itself as the entrepreneurial activity on the part of enterprising businessmen or capitalists. It is interesting to note that the first factory organization was initiated by workers and ^{artisans}. Able artisans and craftsmen innovated changes in the production leading to the emergence of machines and factories. The individual spirit and the scientific tempo which began in the 17th century bore fruit ^{all} in the form of innovations in the field of science. And ^{all} through the period freedom of enterprise was given encouragement because of the growing emancipation of man from all kinds of shackles in the name of liberty and freedom from absolute monarchy and authoritarian papacy. Furthermore, in the 18th century agriculture witnessed one more transformation helping the industries to sustain the momentum.

And by the end of the 18th century Britain contributed a number of facets to the institutional dimension of capitalism like the establishment of national currency (prior to 1800), State supervision of economic activity (16th century), insurance (17th century) and a national bank for managing national debt and becoming a banker to the government (18th century).

In the 19th century capitalism came to be fully established in Britain with the establishment of large-scale industries, belief in the sanctity of the institution of private property, encouragement given to profit by the laissez-faire policy of the State, the policy of free trade pursued by the State helping traders to seek foreign markets, emergence of joint-stock companies, State controlled banking system, and the full maturity of insurance, bills of exchange, stock exchange, and all the other paraphernalia of the capitalist system. The most striking feature of capitalism in the 19th century was its close alliance with politics, otherwise known as finance capital or capitalist imperialism.

DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM IN FRANCE

France was not as fortunate as Britain in gradually developing the capitalist system because it was late in developing both the capitalist spirit and the institutional framework needed for it. Coupled with these weaknesses, France could not enjoy the relative immunity from foreign interference as by Britain. Nor was it successful in possessing a middle-class and acquiring profitable colonies in the world.

Apart from these factors, as compared to Britain, there were a few more special characteristics of France that made her develop the capitalist system much later. France did experience capitalist system in the 18th century but the large-scale industries based on capitalism could not emerge. By then the putting-out system was still powerful along with the continuation of craft guilds.

.../

Second, the French labour force was not very helpful. By nature the French workers are generally contented with their rural homes. Those of the few who migrated to the factories proved to be obstinate and indisciplined. Their technical skill, too, was of a low level. Nearly three-fourths of the industrial workers retained their connections with agriculture. The one concrete situation that contributed for this peculiar character of the French workers was the pattern of land ownership. It was this pattern that made the supply of labour to industrial areas inelastic.

Added to this, France did not proceed on correct lines while developing industries. France did not develop a railway network to make proper use of its abundant deposits of iron ore. Worse was that she was handicapped by inadequate coal deposits.

Third, the political factor, instead of helping capitalism, as in Britain, was a stumbling block for the development of the system. There was political instability from 1789 to 1871. Capital investment, which was the key to economic growth, was held back by lack of confidence on the part of businessmen.

Fourth, even in the institutional framework of capitalism France was not able to come up to the satisfactory level. Substantial proportion of domestic investments went into foreign investments in the 19th century (ventures in Mexico and in Indo-China); and prior to 1789, the formation of capital was retarded by an ugly tax system. Even the banking system was not sound. During the crisis of 1847-48 the Bank of France suspended all discounts and other payments which caused the ruin of many business houses. However, in minor matters relating to the institutional framework of capitalism France was the pioneer:

in promissory notes and sleeping partnership in companies. And in the field of public debt France was one of the earliest leaders.

Although capitalism got distorted in France and industrialization took a long time to develop, the French made their own contribution to the capitalist-cum-industrialist age -- variety and refinement of production. Consumers who place a premium on variety and novelty are attracted by French products -- superiority of the French silks, woollen and cotton cloth, leadership in feminine fashions, fine wines and liquors, perfumes and articles of refined craftsmanship. This unique quality of French industrial products stems from a whole scheme of cultural values which cannot be explained in economic terms. Undoubtedly the French industrial production was not because of incapacity for mechanical inventiveness, nor lack of technical attitude for large-scale industries as proved by today's aeronautic and atomic industries of France. After all, the U.S. had learnt mass production of guns from the French and every text-book of the first American engineering schools was a translation from French texts.

DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM IN GERMANY

The history of German capitalism, too, was beset with a number of weaknesses, particularly those emanating from the factors that promote capitalist system. A huge segment of Germany did possess the required spirit for developing the capitalist ethos, and also they showed tremendous initiative in developing the required technical skills. The weaknesses of German capitalists, however, were primarily caused by the late unification of German States in 1870, lack of outside markets, and involvement in foreign wars.

It was in the 16th century Germany appeared on the map of capitalism. The Fuggers of Germany built up a financial structure of capitalism at Antwerp. But Augusberg in Germany could not maintain its lead. When the commercial activities shifted from the cities of Italy to the Atlantic sea board, sea ports like Amsterdam got the lion's share of it, but not the German cities.

Moreover, as Germany consisted of 300 States till 1870, trade and commerce, an important factor in the origin of capitalism did not pick up and the country could not take a lead in capitalism just as Britain. It was only after 1815 that the number of German States was reduced. Since customs union came into existence called Zollverein in 1819, trade and commerce picked up.

And regarding capitalist spirit, only some parts of Germany developed it. Wherever the Calvinists were present, capitalists came into existence as shown by Weber. Since all Germans were neither ^{Lutherans}, nor Calvinists, the spread of capitalist spirit was limited to some areas only.

But with the unification of Germany in 1870, the country made rapid strides. Germany, for the first time, made effective use of scientific knowledge for developing

industrial processes. It was Germany, for the first time, that established a large number of technical schools and engineering institutes. The skills that came out of these educational institutions enabled Germany to make rapid strides in industrialization or manufacture of goods calling for huge investments of capital.

Added to this, the new German State consciously promoted the rapid industrialization of the country. It pursued protectionist policy and helped the home industry to come up.

This rapid growth of German capitalist industry by-passed the normal stages of capitalist development. Germany did not witness the phases of capital accumulation, capital investment on a small scale, and finally investment of capital on a large scale. Germany developed finance capital bypassing the first two stages since cartels came into existence which resulted in the accumulation of more and more wealth. And in a minor institution of the capitalist structure the country gave a lead -- fire insurance began here.

Finally, Germany was rich in industrial resources which facilitated rapid industrialization and thereby the maturity of capitalist system. "Not in blood and oil but on coal and iron was German empire founded".

DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM IN JAPAN

Japan was a late comer to the world of capitalism just as Germany. It too skipped the stages and the lines on which the classic type of the capitalist system is expected to develop. In the development of Japanese capitalism we do not find clearly the genesis of the capitalist spirit or ethos as well as two other developments, commercial capitalism and industry organised on capitalist lines. But finance capitalism appeared. The prime movers in the development of capitalism in Japan were the role of the State and the development of capitalist techniques.

After the Meiji restoration in 1868, the rulers decided that Japan must industrialize herself to face the challenge of the western intruders. Huge sums were required, but private investments did not come forward. This made the government adopt the policy of subsidizing basic investment in industry.

The early Japanese capitalism was a hot-house variety, growing under the shelter of State protection and subsidy. Big private capitalists were clever. They remained in trade, banking and credit operations and more so in the safe and lucrative fields of government loans. This point clearly reveals that a few people who possessed the capital had the capitalistic spirit of making more and more money irrespective of any consideration. The Japanese State wanted to build the nation, but the Japanese capitalists wanted to accumulate wealth. And capital in rural areas had no inducement to leave the country-side since trade, usury and above all high rent (nearly 60% of tenant's crop) prevented rural capital to move into industrial channels.

Industrialization did not pick up all of a sudden. Ships were built abroad. Till 1914, the equipment needed for factories, mines and railways was imported. Till the

end of 1870s foreigners handled more than nine-tenths of all trade. But one point indicated that Japan was picking up. In 30 years from 1868 to 1897 imports of raw materials for Japanese factories increased five-fold; in the same period, exports of finished goods rose more than twenty-fold.

Logically, from the very early stages of Japanese modern history, the power of financial oligarchy was increased. The State itself sold its enterprises, leaving aside the military establishments, to private capitalists at ridiculously low prices. A few families as the Mitsui, Mitsubishi, Suimitomo and Yasuda grew in riches. There were more families like these, but the four mentioned here constituted the important financial oligarchy called Zaibatsu. Each Combine was dominated by a closely owned holding company. The bulk of the house fortune was concentrated in the company while the family members invested directly in operating enterprises as well. Control was then extended through a network of subsidiaries affiliated by inter-corporate stock holdings, interlocking directorates, management agreements, and loans from the combine bank. Such like oligarchies developed their capitalist empires. Very often this big Zaibatsus swallowed smaller industrial concerns.

This policy of keeping military industries under the State while pampering the private sector continued till the allied occupation of Japan in 1945.

While the industrialization programme of the Meiji elite went ahead, the institutional structure needed for capitalism also came into existence. Modern transportation and banking system were established to support a wide range of heavy industries. In the process large cartels and monopolies based in some cases on the Zaibatsus or money cliques came into existence.

.../

Another interesting development of Japanese capitalism was the intimate relationship between business and government. This alliance from the very beginning tended to discourage the growth of a sturdy middle class i.e. a class of independent businessman with sufficient capital and freedom of opportunity. This development led to great inequalities of wealth and income. It perpetuated the inequality of status and opportunity which runs deeply in Japanese history and tradition. Much worse was the treatment given to the working community. The Zaibatsu concerns carefully maintained a common front in the labour market and thereby stifled the growth of vigorous trade-union movement. Even during the height of Japanese prosperity in the 20s, the workers had no effective collective bargaining power.

But one good that came of the economy being monopolized by the Zaibatsu concerns was modernizing of technology. Indeed the State took the first steps in the form of compulsory education within the country and encouragement to young Japanese to learn from abroad. Large sectors of economy were handled by able technicians and executives employed by the combines. This afforded a device by which industrial investment was accelerated ploughing back the huge profits accumulated to the owners.

This ability of Japanese to learn new technologies as well as to develop them has something to do with Japanese character itself, or nature. Japanese cannot think of being second to anyone. This innate pride could bear fruit because the Japanese have a tremendous ability to adapt technologies of others and make them their own, as for example, the electronics of today.

This development of capitalism and industrialization in Japan proved inimical to liberalism or democracy. Government came to be controlled by the business oligarchies. Although political parties increased their power, they always acted in support of Zaibatsus' interests but not as representatives of any popular movement. Universal male suffrage was granted in 1925 but in the same year the government passed the notorious Peace Preservation Law which was used to suppress groups that were too far to the left. By the mid-30s labour unions and peasant tenant unions were attacked, and harsh restrictions were imposed on political activities.

In the meantime Zaibatsus grew from strength to strength. In the wake of the depression of 1929, big business recovered rapidly mostly because of government-sponsored export campaign. Even the Japanese military cabinet which held power after 1932 could not dislodge this oligarchy. The last party cabinet in Japan, until after the Pacific war, was very close to the Mitsubishi Zaibatsu. The war also became a God-send for them. During the period of war the Zaibatsus moved into heavy industry, assumed control of industrial regulations, and even managed to get insurance against any losses from bombing. War-time Japan was thus not the military dictatorship but a nation led by representatives of business and the government of bureaucracy as well as of soldiers.

In brief, Japanese capitalism grew into maturity under the patronage of State, ^{and} then onwards it led the State while growing from strength to strength.

.../

AGRICULTURAL REVOLUTION 16TH TO THE 18TH CENTURIES

What came to be known as agricultural revolution in Western Europe did not suddenly make its appearance as the grinning Cheshire cat. Many changes and events occurred for centuries, constituting a watershed to give a momentum to agriculture from the 16th century onwards leading to the second watershed in late 18th century.

Prior to the 16th century, beans and peas were cultivated which meant more nitrogen being returned to the soil. The first manuals on agricultural practices appeared. Agricultural book-keeping was an innovation of the monasteries. As agriculture became more and more specialized, wage labourers came to be employed instead of serfs. The net result was a relaxation of the bonds of servitude and a gradual spread of money economy.

Since cash crops also came into existence the erst-while self-sufficient manor was gradually transformed into a production unit relying on sales. The surplus agricultural goods were sold in the up-and-coming towns in the 13th and 14th centuries.

These changes in agricultural practices were accelerated by the innovations that were introduced in the agricultural implements. Water replaced muscle power. The invention of crank and the foregoing processes changed the metallurgical industries of Europe. More important was the movable type that was introduced in printing. Printed books made the diffusion of new agricultural techniques faster and easier.

One more development was that of the Italians. Italian cities invented most of modern accountancy as well as new credit devices for financing of international trade. The Bill of Exchange appeared in the 13th century and along with it came the capitalists.

Finally, a mighty convulsion of the 14th century added a new propulsion to the agricultural revolution from 1500 onwards. In the 14th century occurred a series of bad harvests to be followed by an epidemic disease. Europe was under the grip of typhus, influenza and small-pox. In some areas half to one-third of ^{the} population died. A quarter of European population vanished. The city of Toulouse with a population of 30,000 lost 22,000 people, and 1,400 people died in three days at Avignon. This demographic disaster was followed by the peasant revolts of the second half of the 14th century -- the revolt of the French jacquerie of 1358 and the English Peasants Revolt of 1381. The sum total of these two disasters was serious shortage of labour.

It was this happening in the 14th century that heralded the first change in agriculture in the 16th century. The chief forces that shaped English agriculture in a century and a half after 1500 seem to be three-fold; first, the growth of markets and money economy; second, the development of cloth industry which created a heavy demand for wool; third, price rise which squeezed the landowners in a variety of ways.

The growth of markets and the improvements in transportation changed the self-sufficient medieval village of the early middle ages. In the sixteenth century it could raise crops for market -- grain or wool, or meat and dairy products.

With many landowners seeking profits from their holdings, sheep raising was an obvious, but by no means the only answer. As demand grew from the English weavers, one could be certain to sell his wool for cash. When the price of wool rose rapidly in the sixteenth century, sheep became an even more attractive investment.

.../

This incentive drove many landlords to do something drastic to improve their incomes. The rise in prices which became so rapid after the early years of the century reduced the value of all money rents, dues, and fees that the landlord received. To maintain his standard of living, he had to get more money from his land.

It was, therefore, necessary for him to break away from the old system and adopt the new one. This he could do in two ways: squeeze more money from his tenants, and also transform the tenants' tenure into a lease for five, ten, or twenty years, or for life. This change to leasing of land could be effected by pressure or trickery, legally or illegally. The second way of getting more money was to get rid of the tenants and turn the land to sheep-raising, or large-scale farming.

Thus driven by economic forces, many landlords went further and by one method or another got control of the old common pastures and even the open-fields, fenced them, and turned them into sheep-walks or large-scale agricultural units.

Moreover, confronted with shortage of labour, landlords moved to pastures. In Britain a series of enclosure acts were passed. The cloth that was produced was sold in the Antwerp markets to be ultimately distributed all over Europe. This sea-change in English agriculture was graphically summed up by a contemporary thus: the wool on the back of English sheep appears in the form of the great-coat worn by the Hungarian nobleman.

In Europe the emancipation of rural labourers was achieved by the 16th century although in some pockets serfdom continued. Secondly, agricultural land could be freely bought and sold. It was after the century such reforms were introduced in France, Germany and other European States.

Apart from this development, landlords confronted with shortage of labour, took to improved methods of cultivation. These landowners introduced capitalist forms of cultivation. In England the feeding of cattle and sheep during winter began to be seriously studied. Further, as the lands came to be enclosed, farming became more profitable. The exhaustion of corn land especially in open-field farms by centuries of use, in many cases, necessitated the restoration of fertility by a long period of rest under grass. Finally, even new crops came to be introduced like hops from Flanders. The coming of hops brought a great change in the drinking habits of Englishmen.

In Europe the one area that first initiated the agricultural revolution was the Low Countries or Holland. The Dutch evolved an efficient system of drainage which enabled them to grow new crops as well as raise fodder. One of the crops that was introduced was the potato. This particular cereal acquired a mythology -- women thought that they could get rid of warts, while men thought that it had aphrodisiac qualities. In the 17th and 18th centuries, Britain learnt from the Flemish school but achieved a strikingly higher increase of productivity. Talking of the new crops, Italians were instrumental for introducing rice as a new crop. In the cultivation of wheat the Baltic regions in Russia forged ahead.

The industrial and commercial towns of Flanders and Holland had even in the later middle ages created such a ready market for foodstuffs that intensive and careful farming brought good returns. The merchants of the Dutch towns in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were ready to invest in farm land if it showed signs of being a paying proposition. It was they, rather than local peasants, who in many cases started and paid for the reclamation projects which drained swampy areas and created fertile fields, or polders where heavy crops

could be raised. It was they who paid for the windmills which dotted the Dutch landscape and pumped out the surplus rain water. The intensive agriculture of the Low Countries led to a number of improvements which were only gradually adapted in the rest of Europe.

Among the Dutch improvements were methods of treating soil, fertilizing it, lightening it when it was too heavy, draining it when it was too wet. There was not enough land to allow some of it to lie fallow, or to waste it by breeding poor livestock or raising thin crops. Around the towns, truck gardens for flowers (especially tulips), fruit and vegetables were developed as models of efficient production. Especially important were two innovations pioneered in the Low Countries, which were to revolutionize English agriculture in the eighteenth century. They were the cultivation of clover and turnips.

With clover and turnips as well as grain, the Flemish and the Dutch were able to work out a variety of systems of crop rotation, which greatly increased the yields of their narrow lands and at the same time kept up the fertility of the soil.

This, however, does not mean that even Britain could not achieve anything of her own. From about 1730 till the middle of the 19th century Britain was the Mecca of agricultural experts and became the model for the agricultural revolution in the rest of Europe as well as the United States.

These developments in agriculture as well as animal husbandry were closely inter-related to the developments in trade, commerce and towns. It was the new demands of the towns, as supported by trade and commerce, that made the farming community take to capitalist farming. Another temptation for the rich farmer was to invest the surplus

money in trade and commerce, which brought more and more of wealth. Supporting these developments was the wider circulation of currency and the growing banking system of the times.

The development of capitalist techniques in banking, business, industry, and insurance was paralleled to some degree in the field of agriculture. Just as in the sixteenth century, the eighteenth century witnessed a powerful external force making for agricultural readjustment -- rise in prices. Prices had remained more or less static, or had even declined from the mid-seventeenth to the mid-eighteenth century. After about 1750 they began to rise again, and this rise had become significant by the 1770s.

Thus developments in agriculture once again received a momentum in the 18th century. At that time the developments in agriculture were closely interconnected with industrialization. Beginning during the reign of Queen Anne, however, there came new types of enclosure as created by acts of parliament. They became important after 1740 -- gathered headway rapidly after 1760, and continued till about 1844. As this change involved legislation, and because it had very obvious results, it attracted much attention. Its effect was to change most of English agriculture over to a new large-scale, capitalist, money-making bases while destroying the old agricultural system with its open-fields and its small holdings.

He was also responsible for growing bigger turnips which became the chief fodder of cattle during winter. ²Second, the productivity of soil was increased because of improved methods of manuring and drainage. ³Third, the freeing of agricultural practices from the bonds of custom and usage led to better management skills. Tull's Grain-Drill and the number of frequent cultivation to kill weeds and conserve moisture, were practised by most of the farmers in the 18th century. By the end of the century a crude threshing machine was invented. ⁴Fourth, new methods of sheep breeding were introduced by Robert Bakewell. Bakewell's methods of improved breed of sheep yielded as much wool as the old sheep, but they yielded more meat while maturing in two years. Britain demonstrated for the first time what could be done by science through experiment, observation, recording and experiment again in the field of agriculture. All these developments were given a very wide publicity. Arthur Young, curiously a total failure as a farmer, was the indefatigable missionary of the new developments in agriculture.

Some of these improvements had been applied here and there in the seventeenth century. The introduction of artificial hays like alfalfa and clover, and of root crops like turnips, had made it possible to introduce successful crop rotation without much fallowing of the ground, and keep livestock over the winter and thus increasing the supply of manure. But these developments became common only in the eighteenth century as they were popularized by a series of influential and forward-looking agriculturists. Most of the improvements cost money. But capital for investment in profit-making agriculture had long been coming into England in increasing quantities from successful commerce.

This achievement of Britain in agriculture was because of six reasons: ¹gradual elimination of fallow land and its replacement by continuous rotation of crops; ²introduction of new crops like turnips, clover, hop, maize, carrots, cabbages and potatoes; ³improvement in traditional farming implements as well as introduction of new implements, ⁴selection of seed and breeding of animals; ⁵extension of improvement of arable land, and ⁶extension of the use of horses for farm work, since the horse's speed of traction is on average 50 per cent above that of oxen.

In France the landowners responded in several ways. First they tried to extract in full all the surviving feudal dues, and to revive those that had lapsed or been forgotten. Then they sought to bring into use and under control the waste lands and the common lands on which for centuries peasants had grazed their stock and gathered their firewood.

Because the ideas of the time favoured any attempt to bring new land under cultivation, the government not only did not restrain but it even encouraged these activities. Many parts of France, however, like most of the rest of Europe, were little effected.

All these developments that occurred came to be gradually picked up by the rest of Europe. European farmers came to England to observe methods, buy stock from missionaries and seek advice from the 16th century onwards. But it was only in the 19th century that their agricultural systems came to be transformed. After the French Revolution in 1879, land came to be distributed amongst the peasants and the middle-class. But it did not lead to great agricultural advances as it happened in Britain. The longest resistance to change in traditional legal forms of agriculture was witnessed in Russia.

Serfdom persisted till 1861. In general, on the continent, instead of the Lord dispossessing the peasant, it was the other way round. The aristocrats were unenterprising land-owners and they primarily sought an outlet for their ambition in military, political and diplomatic careers. It was less a landed aristocracy than court nobility. Since they were often bankrupt they readily parted with their lands. And the peasants later turned out to be conservative.

With the development of machines from 1800 onwards the earlier happy-go-lucky traditional methods gave way to more scientific methods, like the improvement of tillage initiated by Jethro Tull, a lawyer. The second group of innovations propelling agricultural revolution were new agricultural machines, the first use of non-animal traction, and the introduction of chemical fertilizers. At this stage Britain lost the lead. In technology the United States led, and in fertilizers it was Germany. Productivity grew at a rate of about one per cent a year, dwarfing all previous records.

Regarding Germany, it should be stated that there was no uniformity. In some areas peasants were protected. The emancipation of serfs was initiated and carried through by the government and it carried on for half a century spilling into the 19th century.

Improved methods of cultivation were taken up by a Prussian law of 1820 and it was only in the 19th century that the importance of rotation of crops and improved methods of raising sheep and cattle were picked up by the German peasants. And again in the 19th century, agricultural advance was facilitated by the establishment of agricultural colleges and institutes.

Thus agricultural revolution had burst its banks. After first creating civilization and then setting a limit to its advance for thousands of years, agriculture suddenly became its propellant. Within a century or so it suddenly demonstrated that it could feed many more people than even before. The growing population that came in the wake of industrial revolution could be sustained only because of the increase in agricultural productivity. Ironically, 19th century also witnessed the beginning of the decline in the primacy of agriculture.

TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION LEADING TO FACTORY INDUSTRIES

Technology is the study of engineering (application of science as per the needs of man). The form in which technological knowledge helps man is machine. The use of machine means displacement of physical labour by machine labour. In other words, each machine is an extension of human limbs. The more the machines the more they multiply the limbs of man to turn out more and more of work.

The technological innovations that changed the machines at the disposal of man began in a spasmodic and romantic manner. The men who were instrumental for changing the processes of production by introducing technological innovations in the then existing machinery had neither the knowledge of science, nor trained in engineering. They were purely guided by hunches and a number of them happened to be artisans and workers. Some of them, when they had hit upon better methods of production, romanticised their achievements. When the traditional spinning wheel was changed by artisans, it was named as 'spinning jenny'. Another invention was known as 'mule'. Wilkinson left a will stating that he should be buried in an iron coffin. Arkwright was a barber, but was an active promoter, manager, superintendent and tiller. In the third capacity he sped from mill to mill in his coach of four to supervise his workers. For all these innovations he was knighted.

Since, by nature, technological changes have a cumulative effect on man and society, the changes that occurred in the 20th century were far more rapid. The compulsion of war, too, added to the momentum of the technological changes. By the twenties and thirties, the tempo became far too great. And till today it had not ceased. In general, the changes in the 20th century can

be regarded as the third phase of the technological age which was unleashed in the mid-18th century. A more important feature of the 20th century is the spread of these changes to all parts of the world, leading to the inevitable consequences affecting all levels of human life ranging from sensibilities to matter-of-fact facets of human life.

The use of machines in big factories increased the amount of production and the rate of production, that is, fewer people could produce more goods in less time. Further, goods produced by machines in large quantities can be turned out more cheaply than goods produced by hand in smaller quantities. This means lower prices for the buyers. Thus, as a result of the factory system, the common people could afford to buy products that formerly only the rich could afford. One more consequence. More and more raw materials were needed to 'feed' the machines and new, or more markets were needed to sell the products in. First, England and later, other European nations, competed with each other to get control of as much of world as possible in order to assure themselves of more of raw materials and markets.

The domestic system, or the putting-out system started giving way to the factory system after 1750. The units of production which earlier used simple tools along with all manual power now came to rely more and more on steam power. Coupled with this, factory displaced workshops in homes, and the machines displaced simple tools. The transition from the traditional to the factory system was very gradual: by the end of the 19th century only steam power helped transporting industry and from the mid-19th century electrical power very often replaced steam power.

Many machines were used before 1750: pendulum clock, compass, thermometer, air-pump, printing press,

etc. but mechanical inventions became faster after 1750. Two centuries of gunnery made mining and metallurgy much better. Early industrial changes were based on Europe's accumulation of skills and traditional occupations and their extension to new fields. The Rhinelanders learnt to make cast iron in the 14th century and from 1600 onwards gradual improvements were made in the making of blast furnaces. The first steam engines were built by a miscellaneous collection of blacksmiths, wheelwrights and carpenters while engineers generally refused to work. It was only with the invention in 1794 of Maudslay's slide-rest that machine tools became perfect, leading to revolution in engineering industry. For a long time it was a matter of hit and miss process. It was by hunch that new processes were thought over.

More significant was the fact that the eighteenth-century changes in technological skills gradually came to be science based. The breakthrough here was achieved by James Watt when he discovered the principle of steam engine. For the first time, it was put to practical use by Stevenson in early 19th century foreboding momentous consequences. Stevenson improved the "Puffing Billy" so that it had a top speed of 15 miles an hour. By that time the smelting process of iron, too, was improved so that more and more sophisticated machinery could be manufactured. Far more momentous in the thirties of the 19th century was the discovery of electricity. All the three -- metallurgy, steam power and electrical power -- gave birth to engineering and engineers. Significantly the word 'scientist' was coined in 1840.

From this time onwards all the new technological changes were backed by the accumulating knowledge of science. In the same period medical knowledge also was metamorphosed leading to increase in longevity, and thus to growth of populations. By the end of the 19th century

the impact of the technological revolution was felt even at home in the form of electric bulb, electric call-bell, telephone and camera while social life came to be transformed with railways, steam boats, street-lamps and the penny-farthing bicycles. Thus by the end of the 19th century the second phase of technological revolution was completed.

The centre-piece of the technological revolution was the factory. Each factory is built around an assemblage of machines. Each factory is metaphorically thousands of human limbs functioning in the form of a symphony. Although the word 'factory' was coined in the 16th century, factory as a concrete entity came into existence in the 18th-century Britain. The emergence of factory not only transformed the whole process of production but also caused transformation of the social milieu. What happened in Britain came to be repeated all over the world. The owner or the proprietor of the factory relied increasingly on the assemblage of machines. The dependence became possible because of the growing profits. The men who were employed in the factory sold their labour and received in return wages. Often the wages in the early period were close to subsistence level of living which brought in its turn a large number of ugly social consequences like heavy drinking, prostitution, diseases, and new kinds of crime.

Under the factory system the workers came under supervision and they were controlled and disciplined. Second, the factory rested on division of labour. Third, since equipping of factory meant using more and more of machines, it called for more of capital. In other words, the control of industry passed into the hands of a new group of capitalists. A very interesting feature of this capitalism was the spirit of saving. James Watt, Josiah Wedgwood and Arkwright saved more and spent less. These

capitalist employers acted as social trustees of the surplus earnings of industry and used them to raise industrial plants rather than distribute them as dividends or higher wages.

Germany too witnessed the factory system after 1870. A large number of factors contributed for this development -- enterprising and energetic men, sufficient capital to introduce improvements in industrial production, profitable market, sufficient raw-material, adequate number of suitable workers, and improved techniques of production.

The developments in France, on the other hand, were different. The growth was very slow. Even in 1914 France was predominantly rural. The chief reason for the slow growth of industries in France was the emphasis on the production of quality goods. Britain and Germany produced mass consumption goods, but France emphasized on manual skill and artistic workmanship.

Industry primarily developed in Northern France since raw materials and fuel as well as the markets were available. Coal was scattered all over the country, the deposits facilitated the establishment of many small industries in textiles, porcelains and other similar products.

French workers did accept the factory system as in other countries. And the Factory Legislation of 1892 and 1900 created a reservoir of labour which would be utilized on home work. Most of the home industries produced consumption goods, whose market was fluctuating and small.

Further, France witnessed a peculiar development in industrial combinations. The French cartels endeavoured to secure to hold and keep industrial prices necessary for their existence by regulating competition. The spirit underlying these cartels was that of the guild

it
and/was strongly influenced by traditions of artistic enterprise. The cartels were left to themselves to carry through sales and other operations connected with the business.

All told, the worker was alienated from the product. In course of time the white-collared workers also became cogs fitting into the structure of factory. They too received monetary remuneration for the functions that they discharged. All the time the men who owned, managed, or controlled the factories looked for only profits while underrating the importance of men, machines and products. Thus, all sections of people came to be alienated from the process of production. This disjunction between man and what man needs for his survival and security has led to more and more loneliness or solitude of man. In brief, the net result of the technological revolution, with the factory system as its hub, is the total alienation of man with everything that is around him.

SPREAD OF TECHNOLOGY AND FACTORY SYSTEM

1. British technologists (skilled artisans and engineers) emigrated often, under strong financial inducements from abroad. The British engineers and mechanics established shops to manufacture machinery in Belgium in late 19th and early 20th centuries. Later the machines were shipped from Belgium to France, to Germany and elsewhere on the Continent.
2. During the decade before the outbreak of the French Revolution, machines and sketches of machines were smuggled out of Britain. Also enterprising Frenchmen went to England to study the new methods of smelting iron and that was how the famous Cruesot Works were founded in 1781.
3. One country which kept pace with Britain in the first half was Belgium since the guild system was already broken and she had an abundant supply of iron and coal. Before the middle of the 19th century, Belgium exported machines to Holland, Russia and Germany. On the other hand, mechanization was introduced in Russia, Spain, Italy and Scandinavian countries only towards the end of the 19th century.
- 4-a. Mechanization of industry was late in Germany because of various reasons. Firstly, Germany was a group of States. Second, German markets were not sufficiently large to absorb the products of large-scale industries. Third, the home market was still small because of the difficulties of transportation. Finally, Germany lacked in free capital since she could not take the same advantage of profitable foreign trade just as Britain.
- 4-b. It was only after 1870 when the Germans built networks of railways that industrialization picked up. Again, it was only after the unification of Germany after 1870 it had a geographical advantage. Located in the geographical centre of Europe, it could gain access to markets

and raw materials in all directions while Britain, France, Italy, Spain and Russia stood on the periphery of the European continent.

4-c. The German industrialization was to a great extent facilitated by the excellent schooling system. Not only was education made compulsory before any other country did so, the curriculum was made secular instead of religious. Apart from the nature of the curriculum, Germany established excellent technical high schools and the best university system to yield results from the achievements of science.

4-d. When Germany picked up momentum in industrialization the State control proved beneficial unlike the laissez faire policy of Great Britain. Thousands of well-trained chemists constituted a sort of intellectual proletariat working for German industries.

4-e. Germans made a breakthrough in electrical industry with Siemens, who invented the dynamo. The Germans were the first to develop electric railway in 1879 and contributed to numerous other inventions. This electrical industry was applied in various fields like communications, transportation, metallurgy and innumerable machines, and all appliances utilizing electric motors.

4-f. One more quality that facilitated remarkable German development within three decades was its ability to apply science although the basic discoveries were made by the French and English scientists.

5. The U.S. introduced machines immediately after independence in 1783. By 1860 she had well-established textile, steel and shoe industries. The industries of the U.S. grew rapidly after 1870.

IMPERIALISM

Political rule over one's own people living in a specific geographic area, means rule over a kingdom or a State. Whenever such a State or kingdom extends its control over other peoples and other areas, the kingdom or the State becomes an empire; and whenever a justification or a theory is offered for an empire, it comes to be known as imperialism.

The practice of establishing empires and formulating justifications or theories for them is very ancient. The earliest imperial powers were those of Rome, Egypt, Alexander's and that of the Huns. In modern times, imperial powers emerged from the 19th century onwards although there were imperial powers in the 16th century like those of Spain, Portugal, Holland, France and Britain.

The imperial systems that came into existence in the 19th century are of a distinct nature because their emergence was facilitated by the rise of capitalism in Europe from the 16th century onwards. Apart from this distinguishing trait, the imperial powers of the 19th century possessed two more qualities: the imperial powers exploited the resources of the colonies for the benefit of their own people, and in this process the imperial powers were instrumental for unleashing the forces of modernity.

Whatever may be the administrative policies and the practices followed by colonial powers, they had a number of basic similarities. All believed in the purity and inevitability of their righteous missions. The conviction that colonial rule was thrust on them by history and genetics was uniform. The assurance that peoples under colonialism would be bettered by the system was general. The determination to defend their possessions against foreign rivals or domestic troublemakers was powerful and unrelenting.

Imperialism after 1870 was facilitated by a handful of factors; development in transport and communications, need for export of capital for constructing railways, dams and highways, and occasional emigration of their peoples in small numbers to the newly acquired areas.

It is interesting to note that just prior to, as well as during the active phase of imperialism, a number of intellectuals and statesmen expressed their reservations about its virtues. Gladstone was worried in 1877 that British intervention in Egypt would burden the country with a North African Empire. After Algiers was taken by France, many Frenchmen wanted that it should be surrendered. Every imperial project of Julius Ferry in France resulted in his being thrown out of office. Till 1876, Bismarck was hostile to acquiring overseas positions while claiming that Germany was a saturated country.

Despite these doubts, imperialism went apace. New markets were needed to absorb the excess of goods produced in Europe while the need for raw materials grew to satisfy the maws of European industry; a compelling need for investing capital where returns would be higher than at home without any insecurity to them; and the economic depression of 1873 to 1896 served as an impetus to this phase of colonialism.

In appearance the emergence of imperialism in modern times was primarily because of the content and logic of capitalist system, but a close analysis of the imperial structures of modern times reveals that no one explanation is satisfactory. In other words, no theory of imperialism can help us to analyse the imperial structures to the satisfaction of all thinking individuals.

Traditionally, there are three theories of imperialism.¹ According to the Marxist theory, capitalist societies find it impossible to find enough markets for their

products and for investment of surplus capital within their own territories. Faced with the dilemma of either abandoning capitalism by distributing more wages, or abandoning the whole process of capitalist production, the capitalists found a way out in the colonies that were acquired by their home countries. Whichver capitalist country had colonies, ^{had} found ready markets as well as areas where they could invest their surplus capital. Lenin, Bukharin and others identified imperialism and capitalism as one and the same thing. In the words of Lenin "Imperialism is capitalism in that phase of its development in which the domination of monopolies and finance capital has established itself, in which the export of capital has acquired very great importance, in which the division of the world among the big international trusts has begun, in which the partition of all the territory of the earth amongst the great capitalist powers has been completed". In brief, capitalism is the villain of the piece while imperialism is only its necessary or probable explanation.

Many attractions pulled capitalists into foreign lands: cheap labour, raw materials, enforceability of favourable terms of trade, job opportunities, and land suitable for exploitation or settlement. But many writers refute the economic causation of the First World War and thereby the economic motivation in European expansion after 1870. Norman Angel documented the unprofitability of war before the First World War. Another writer found that only 29 per cent of the wars from 1820 to 1929 can be directly attributed to economic factors. And writers point out the absurdity of relationship between capitalism and imperialist policies by pointing out the expansionist record of Soviet Russia. Some writers regard the expansionist policy of Europe to be fundamentally irrational.

* ² The second theory is that of Hobson who was associated with the liberal school of thought. This school concedes the view that finance capital has found a way out for the dilemma of capitalism: colonies as markets and investment areas. Till this point, Hobson is one with the Marxists. But Hobson maintains that such an imperialistic development is not logical development of capitalism and it can be averted. The colonial development of capitalism is primarily because of maladjustments within the capitalist system. Imperialist expansion is not the inevitable and not even the most rational method of disposing the surpluses in a capitalist society. Surpluses have resulted out of maldistribution of purchasing power, and therefore, the remedy lies in the expansion of home market through economic reforms, such as increase in purchasing power and elimination of surplus savings.

This approach of the liberal school was further elaborated in the later period. Some of the later-day liberals like Norman Angel argued that free trade was the panacea of all the evils of modern society. Whenever goods are permitted to move freely across the frontiers, each country would develop those of the industries in which it has a comparative advantage over the other countries. On the other hand, protection of industries encourages inefficient ways of production. When all the countries of the world agree to the policy of free trade, there is no room for any sort of complaint. Each country would come to play a role which nature has gifted it. In other words, no one country would complain of the exploitation of the other countries because natural assets and technological skills differ from country to country.

* ³ The third theory of imperialism is known as the Devil Theory. The Nye Committee of 1934-36 of the U.S. examined the influence of financial and industrial

interests when the United States intervened in the First World War. The Committee identified some groups which profited from war like the manufacturers of war material, international bankers and such others. Since such segments of people profited from war they must be interested in waging war. In this manner, the Committee came to the conclusion that war profiteers transformed themselves into warmongers (the Devils), who planned wars in order to enrich themselves more and more.

X Apart from these three principal theories which explain imperialism after 1870, there were also semi-theories also. Racism, economic liberalism, humanitarianism, evangelism, jingoism, ethnocentrism, social Darwinism and many more were talked about to provide a logical and dignified covering to the new phase of imperialism. Racialism was expanded by Gobineau. He attempted to demonstrate that the Blacks possess an animal character and that no civilized society could be created by them. Social Darwinists claimed that the material wealth of the West and the poverty of the rest of the world was proof enough for the superiority of the Whites. The repeated victories of the imperialist armies were attributed more to genetic endowment than to the possession of the Gatling gun.

Some justified imperialism by the supposed inferiority of the subject peoples. Condemning the colonial peoples as inferior was a common pastime of the colonial authorities. Some men ceased to be men and became Fuzzies-Wuzzies or Wogs. Kaiser Wilhelm coined the new term 'yellow peril'. Of course, the kindest description of colonial peoples was that of Kipling: "half devil and half child".

While these arrogant theories were postulated, some pioneers of colonialism talked in vague terms of altruism. Persons like Raffles thought that to subjugate exotic peoples was to liberate them. The concept appealed to the western ego. Along with these altruistic exploiters, the missionaries thought emancipating the colonial peoples from ignorance. Once the natives wore trousers and led docile and devout lives like the good working class people at home, both God and the Colonial Office would be pleased.

On occasions, the imperialist powers assumed moral superiority. They thought they were representing progress. A classic summary of the imperialist thought comes from President McKinley's explanation for the annexation of the Philippines. "... walked the floor of the White House night after night ... and prayed Almighty God for light and guidance more than one night, and one night late it came to me this way -- I don't know how it was, but it came: (1) that we could not give them back to Spain -- that would be cowardly and dishonourable; (2) that we could not turn them over to France or Germany -- our commercial rivals in the Orient -- that would be bad business and discreditable; (3) that we could not leave them to themselves -- they were unfit for self-government -- and they would soon have anarchy and misrule over there worse than Spain's was; and (4) that there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all, and to educate the Filipinos, and uplift and civilize and Christianize them, and by God's grace do the very best we could by them, as our fellowmen for whom Christ also died, and then I went to bed, and went to sleep, and slept soundly..."

All the theories mentioned above make an interesting reading, but a close analysis shows that none of them can satisfactorily explain the empire-building and the imperialistic expansions of the various powers of the

world. ¹ No one can say that the expansionist wars of Alexander the Great were prompted either by economic considerations or by the machinations of armament manufacturers. Germany's Austro-Prussian and the Franco-German wars of 1866 and 1870 respectively, had no economic objectives but were prompted by the desire for nationalism and the still more important desire for possession of power so that Germany under the captainship of Prussia could play a dominant role in Europe. Neither Bismarck nor his generals were motivated by economic considerations.

² Secondly, the main period of colonial expansion which the economic theorists tend to identify with imperialism preceded the age of finance capitalism, and therefore, the emergence of imperialism cannot be attributed to the inner contradictions of the decaying capitalist system. History shows that the colonial acquisitions of the 19th and 20th centuries were meagre as compared to those of the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries. On the other hand, history shows that the last phase of capitalism witnessed the liquidation of empires in the form of retreat from Asia and Africa by Great Britain, France and the Netherlands. The weightage that is given to foreign investments in the new-found colonies of Europe is not factually correct. A greater part of European investments after 1870 flowed into independent States in Europe rather than to the colonies. British investments were mostly in North and South America. Trade with colonial countries was only a small fraction of all British and French foreign trade and a very minute part for Italy, Germany and Japan. The German colonial conquests were prior to the emergence of cartels within the country; on the other hand, monopolies were hardly present in England and France during the period of imperialistic expansion. Very often, political interests manipulated foreign investments rather than the reverse.

Modern historians find the mainspring of European expansion in the political arena of world strategies and ideologies, but not in the expanding industrial economies. The unification of Germany and Italy led to aggressive nationalism in both the countries. The colonial adventures of France after war with Prussia in 1870 were primarily for the sake of regaining the lost sense of glory and grandeur, to give experience to their military cadres, and expand its potential manpower for possible revenge.

3 Thirdly, the thesis of Lenin ignored some unpalatable facts. Most of the foreign investments of European colonial powers were made in South America and Russia, but not in colonial territories. Second, the standard of living of the working classes was high in countries like Denmark and Sweden which had no colonies, but low in France and Belgium which had large colonial territories. Third, the so-called glut of capitalism which Lenin talked about, existed centuries before the emergence of finance capital.

The Devil Theory and the economic theories of imperialism imply that capitalists used governments as the tools in instigating imperialistic policies. But history does not bear evidence to this thesis. Imperialistic policies were generally conceived by governments first and then the capitalists were summoned to support those policies. Professor Schumpeter remarks that the domination of financiers over international politics is a newspaper fairy tale which is absolutely at variance with facts. Far from being the instigators of imperialist designs, capitalists as a group are lukewarm about imperialistic policies. The merchant and manufacturing classes have always opposed a foreign policy which might unleash wars. The interests of capitalism require peace, and not war. War carries with it an element of

irrationality and chaos, which are alien to the very spirit of capitalism. The captain of industry is not more driven toward his "imperialistic" goal by economic necessity or personal greed than was Napoleon I. Personal gain and the solution of economic problems through imperialistic expansion are for all of them a pleasant after-thought, a welcome by-product, but not the goal by which the imperialistic urge is attracted.

The imperialist expansion after the mid-19th century was neither very logical nor profitable. Without any overseas territories, both Sweden and Switzerland reached high levels of political and economic well-being. On occasions, loss of colonial holdings did not necessarily bring ruin, as for example, Japan. At times, the costs of administering, policing and defending powers exceeded the profits of the colonial ventures. If the First World War is seen as primarily a struggle for imperial spoils, it is clear that colonialism did not pay. Profits from Vietnam could never cover the costs of Verdun.

How is it then that the economic theories of imperialism, which are so completely at variance with the facts of history, could hold sway over the public mind? There are two explanations. One is the climate of opinion in the western world. From the beginning of the 20th century there has grown a general tendency to reduce political problems to economic ones. The capitalists and their critics were equally guilty of this fundamental error. The capitalists after they had freed themselves from the pre-capitalistic age, took for granted that general prosperity and peace would emerge. The critics of capitalists were equally convinced that these aims could be achieved only through a reform, or by abolishing the capitalist system. Thus both the camps sought economic explanations for political problems. Bentham in early 19th century

advocated surrender of colonies as the only means of doing away with imperialistic conflicts that led to war. Proudhon, Cobden and their disciples in mid-nineteenth century saw in tariffs the sole source of international conflicts and argued that peace lay in extending free trade. The second reason for the popularity of the economic thesis lies in its plausibility. Baffled by the mystery of so threatening and often so murderous a historic force as imperialism, the analysts coolly opted for the inherent pulls of the capitalist system as the villain of the piece. In other words, not able to explain the complexity of the phenomenon of imperialism, people readily accepted the view that expansion of economic imperialism was because of the developments within capitalism.

OUTLINES OF COLONIAL EXPANSION AND RIVALRY

By the 19th century European powers expanded far and wide -- the Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, French and British colonial empires followed one another. The nature of this expansion was a queer amalgam of trade, christianizing, adventure, loot, national pride and conquest. Some of the empires spread themselves across the land unlike the maritime powers mentioned above, as for examples, the Habsburg and Ottoman empires. Russia, too, advanced rapidly into southern and central Asia during the 19th century just as the U.S. did in the New Hemisphere.

The same colonial expansion continued in the 19th century too, and the expansionist activity between 1870 and 1914 has generally been described as the age of imperialism. The first explanation for this development was that of Hobson. According to him, the economic taproot of imperialism was excessive capital in search of investment. A correct remedy was internal social reform and equitable distribution of wealth: whenever these remedies are taken up, there could be no excess of goods or capital clamouring to use imperialism in order to find markets.

This argument has been given a new twist in Lenin's pamphlet, Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism, to emphasize the importance of finance capital rather than industrial capital. By the time he wrote, there was conspicuous improvement in the economic condition of workers in the advanced countries. This became possible, according to Lenin, because capitalism found a new proletariat to be exploited in the colonies. The home proletariat renounced its revolutionary fervour and collaborated with the bourgeoisie. Such improvements, Lenin maintained could be at the most temporary since imperialist rivalries must lead to war.

But history does not substantiate this thesis of Lenin. Prior to 1870 most of the European powers were hostile to colonies. By the year 1820 some of the European powers lost their colonies without suffering any great economic distress -- France lost colonial possessions in America, Spain lost South American territories, and Britain lost her 13 American colonies. Such being the story, a good number of thinkers welcomed the end of colonialism. Bentham urged France to liberate her colonies. Cobden preached free trade. France opened her colonies for all nations in 1861. Gladstone believed the whole empire would dissolve itself. Even Disraeli compared the colonies to millstones around the British necks. Bismarck in 1868 said that the advantages claimed for colonial possessions were illusory.

Despite these views against colonial expansion, there began a scramble for colonies after 1870. France, one of the least industrially developed countries, more than doubled her colonial possessions between 1850 and 1870 -- Algeria, Senegal and Indo-China. After 1870, French republican leaders like Ferry and Gambetta contributed for further colonial expansion in Tunisia and Tonkin. All the time the French public opinion was vigorously opposed to the colonial expansion.

Even in the British expansion after 1870 we cannot find any economic reasons. If Britain was interested in exporting its surplus capital, she could not have invented the concept of dominion status and readily granted this status to Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa by 1910. After all, Britain knew that trade with North American colonies increased after they were separated from her control and British migration to the U.S. was more advantageous than the returns from all the other territories of British empire put together. Also

Britain found greater opportunity to invest in Argentine railways than in the Indian railway system.

Contrary to this economic thesis, Germany gained great number of economic advantages in Eastern Europe, the Balkans and the Ottoman empire without possessing colonies.

Apart from the non-economic character of colonial expansion after 1870, one more feature was the concentration of the thrust of new imperialism in the two continents of Africa and East Asia. This expansion of Europe towards these two continents coincided with growing political tensions amongst European countries. Naturally, the colonial expansion of European powers bears the same remorseless qualities. The naked power politics of the new colonialism was the projection of the inter-state frictions and rivalries of Europe rather than the compulsions inherent in finance capitalism. Further, the growing population of Europe found its outlets to the United States and Australia. Neither Africa nor Eastern Asia was climatically attractive for large-scale white settlements.

Nonetheless, this is not to totally deny the place of economic factor in the new imperialistic expansion of European powers. Both Africa and Asia offered many of the raw materials needed by Europe: cotton, silk, rubber, vegetable oils and rare minerals. Besides, the quest for markets became acute after 1870 because each of the European nations followed a policy of protection. The governments were equally responsible in Europe to take up the task of exploiting backward territories.

Despite these economic considerations, there were also certain political considerations which made European countries go for colonies. The ports of Turkey and Far East were valuable as naval bases no less than as inroads

for trade and investment. Europe was haunted by the fear of war after 1870 and this fear itself gave a new propulsion to the imperialistic scramble, apart from the economic necessity for more markets. In brief, the co-existence of economic interests with political aims contributed for the imperialistic designs of European countries, except for those of Italy and Russia which were primarily prompted by political considerations.

What is true of men is equally true of nations. Both aspire to have more than what they already have. It is only when a nation had a group of people or political leaders who are eager to expand the country's interests are present, that the economic compulsions also help them. What determined whether or not a country became imperialistic, was more the activity of a small group of people, often intellectuals, economists or patriotic publicists and politicians anxious to ensure national security and self-sufficiency, rather than the economic conditions of the country itself.

Apart from these two principal considerations that influenced colonial expansion there were a medley of other considerations which influenced the desire for colonies. One of them was the activities of explorers and adventurers like Da Brazza in Equatorial Africa, Stanley in the Congo basin, and the German, Karl Peters in East Africa. At times the promptings of genuine scientific discovery, taste for adventure, piratical love of money and power like that of Cecil Rhodes prompted men to take an active role in colonial expansion.

Apart from these variegated people, the Christian missionaries had their own share in the colonial expansion of European powers. David Livingstone was a London missionary who went out with the twin object of opening

paths both for commerce and Christianity. It was to supplement his efforts that Stanley was sent later. France, too, sent organized Christian missions into various parts of the world to convert the heathens into Christianity.

One more element in the growth of imperialism was the administrator and the soldier. Such men welcomed the opportunity to bring order and efficient administration out of chaos. At times, the colonial powers found the colonies to be outlets for seekers of the social ladder. Quite often, Britons handicapped by a lineage or an unfashionable school were rocketed into the elite by taking up the burden of the Empire.

Thus, the source and the nature of imperialism were variegated and they varied from one country to another. It was not just that trade followed the flag but with the flags accompanied the buccanner, the Bible and the bureaucrat, along with the banker and the businessman. The unexplored and unexploited parts of the earth offered a host of possible advantages, which in the competitive world of late 19th century, few could resist seizing.

ACQUISITION OF COLONIES

Between 1870 and 1900 Britain, France and Russia had added millions of square miles and millions of people to their colonial possessions. In the same period, Germany, Belgium and Italy acquired comparatively less populous and smaller colonies. Added to this, the old colonial empires of Portugal and Netherland survived while gaining in more importance.

All these acquisitions were carried by different political forces. The achievements of Belgium were almost the personal achievement of the king. In Britain and Germany, the achievement was that of the conservative governments. In Russia the official military class and bureaucracy were responsible for the expansion toward East.

When we look at the beneficiaries of this expansionism, there is no uniformity amongst them. King Leopold of Belgium, Cecil Rhodes and many of the individual empire-builders amassed great personal fortunes. But some of the initiators like Ferry in France and Crispi in Italy, earned only disrepute. In some countries organized public opinion functioned as pressure groups for supporting the cause of imperialism. Disraeli committed the Conservative Party to the policy of imperialism in 1872. In the eighties a colonial society and a society for German colonization was formed in Germany. By then, the British conservative imperialists founded the Primrose League while the liberals followed it up with the Imperial Federation League.

As European powers went ahead with colonies they made a series of compromises to avoid open confrontation. The French conquest of Algeria in early 19th century and Annam after 1870 and the British conquest of Nigeria and Ashanti in Africa in the nineties, caused no ripple in international affairs. At times one power gave support to

another power. Bismarck encouraged France to expand into Tunisia. Bismarck and Jules Ferry summoned an international conference to settle the future of Congo. In 1884 Britain and Portugal set up a joint commission to control the navigation of the Congo river. All these efforts reached a watershed in the Treaty of Berlin in 1885. It was agreed that any power that effectively occupied African territory should duly notify the other powers. This agreement led to the rapid partition of Africa and inaugurated a new era of colonialism. It was also agreed that slavery should be made illegal. Thus the treaty of 1885 was a contract among the powers to pursue further partition of Africa as amicably as possible and also avoid competition amongst themselves.

And the Congo free state was formed in 1885. European powers set up chartered companies to develop various areas of Africa. Each power established protectorates over areas or outright acquired territories. Some like Germany enlarged and consolidated their former protectorates. Great Britain inched northwards from its base at the Cape through Bechuanaland, Rhodesia and Nyasaland. These acquisitions were followed by the taking over of Uganda and Nigeria. Soon other countries also imitated the same process. Italy took over Eritrea and the coastal strip of Somaliland.

This expansionism of European powers in Africa was felt in the Far East also. New Guinea was partitioned amongst the Dutch, the British and Germans in 1885. Germany occupied several islands including the Marshall. North Borneo was taken over by British in 1888 and later the islands of Gilbert, South Solomon and Tonga. France occupied all the islands adjoining Tahiti. Even the U.S. joined the game. She not only annexed Puerto-Rico and set up a protectorate over Cuba after her war with Spain,

but she also took the Philippines and the Hawaii islands. Thus by the time the 20th century began, the whole of Southern Pacific was partitioned, both amongst the old colonial powers and the new colonial powers of Germany and the United States.

In the North Pacific the scramble was primarily for China. By 1870 Britain and France secured treaties that gave their diplomats and traders considerable opportunities and security for trade with China. More than a dozen cities like Canton and Shanghai were opened to all Europeans as treaty ports where the traders could enjoy immunity from Chinese laws. To protect Europeans, British and American gunboats policed the Uangtse river in the south, and staffs of European officials were introduced to collect customs duties. While the Western powers penetrated China from the Eastern shores, large parts of the Chinese empire were annexed by Russia in the north. Russia established Vladivostak in 1860 while reaching till river Amur. During the eighties, France annexed the rest of Indochina; and Britain, the rest of Burma.

This scramble for colonies in the Far East was completed by the emergence of the Asian Imperial Power, Japan. In 1876 Japan succeeded in detaching Korea from China. In 1894 Japan defeated China and imposed a treaty by which China not only ceded Korea, but also the island of Formosa and Liaotung peninsula. The sudden emergence of Japan was resented by the European colonial powers and they forced Japan to restore the Liaotung peninsula to China.

Humiliated in this manner, China made a series of concessions for the purpose of westernizing herself. Russia made China lease Liaotung peninsula to her. Germany took Kiaochow on lease and some concessions on Shantung

peninsula. Britain took the port of Weiheiwei and consolidated her sphere of influence. The U.S. demand for the open-door policy was backed by Britain.

China resented all these intrusions. A revolt broke out in 1899 known as the Boxer Rebellion. The European powers as well as Japan and the U.S. combined together and suppressed the rebellion. A large indemnity was exacted from China and stringent controls were imposed on her. One other reaction of China was the nationalist revolution led by Sun Yat-Sen in the southern provinces in 1911. It overthrew the Manchurian dynasty and began the prolonged revolutionary process that reached its climax in the Communist Revolution of 1949.

The successful imperial penetration into the crumbling Chinese empire intensified the rivalries among imperial powers. Japan and Russia fought out in 1904 for the possession of Manchuria and Korea. In this war Russia was defeated at the great battle of Mukden. By the Treaty of Portsmouth, Japan regained the Liaotung peninsula with Port Arthur and also the southern half of northern island of Sakhalin, a protectorate over Korea and concessions in Manchuria. Since the Russian expansion was checkmated in the Far East, Russia diverted her attention to the Balkans, although her defeat in the Far East precipitated the revolution at home in 1905. More important was the consequences of Japanese victory. Admiring what westernization could bring to any non-European power, nationalist revolutions occurred in Persia in 1905 and in Turkey in 1908. Before 1914 the consequence of imperialism in Asia was the stimulation of nationalism in the colonial countries of Asia. All that the war did was to weaken Russia still further, gave Japan the opportunity to become a great world power in the Pacific and thus hastened the tensions that were already apparent to end up as the First World War.

COLONIAL COLLISIONS

The expansion of European powers after 1885 led to frequent collisions in remote parts of the world. Such collisions worsened the tensions between the powers in Europe. Even then, there is no evidence that the colonial tensions were decisive in determining the final alignment of powers before the outbreak of the First World War; but on the other hand, almost all the colonial issues were as good as settled after 1904 and the armed camps came into existence only when the Eastern Question came to predominate. There is evidence to show that all the important colonial disputes were settled before 1914. On a number of occasions the western powers forged new links of fraternity just as the one against China to suppress the Boxer rising in 1900 and against Japan in 1905.

And the naval rivalry between Britain and Germany was not exclusively related to the possession of colonies. The final settlement gave for France a predominant role in the administration of Morocco. Germany was humiliated. Once again Morocco figured in 1908. Finally by an arbitration at the Hague it was decided that France should have political predominance on Morocco while she undertook not to harm Germany's economic interests. For the third time the Moroccan crisis figured in 1911. A German warship appeared at the port of Agadir as a retaliation to French occupation of Fez, the most important town in Morocco. Europe was agitated. Thomson writes that it roused the sleeping dogs all over Europe, in Madrid, in London as well as in Berlin. Lloyd George issued a serious warning. The British fleet prepared for action. Germany ultimately yielded to a French protectorate over Morocco, while France granted two strips of territories to Germany in French Congo. But the end-result of this conflict was that Anglo-German rivalry was worsened and public opinion was outraged in both the countries.

To examine further, the six major disputes that arose in international affairs before the outbreak of the First World War were not solely guided by colonial and imperial considerations. The rivalry between Britain and France reached a climax with the Fashoda incident in 1898. The British influence in Egypt grew as the French were in a position to help the Khedive when he was in trouble. Also the British had built the Aswan Dam. Although Britain suffered a setback in Sudan she was firmly established in the lower Nile. She even decided to reconquer Sudan. In the meantime France thought of controlling a continuous belt of territory stretching from Dakar to the Gulf of Aden, from the basin of the Congo and French West Africa right across the upper reaches of the Nile and joining to Abyssinia while French troops advanced and occupied the strategic point of Fashoda. Soon after the British troops under Kitchener made their appearance. War hysteria was whipped up both in Britain and France. Finally, an agreement was reached in 1899 by which France withdrew from Fashoda. France realized that alliance with Russia alone was not enough, and her interests lay first in security in Europe against Germany. Soon after the incident both Britain and France drew together.

* The South African incident (the second) relating to the Boer affair, too, shows that colonial and imperial considerations did not prevail over political considerations. The British and the Dutch settlers did not see eye to eye with each other. The Dutch were primarily agriculturists; whereas, the British were interested in mining. In order to preserve their own way of life the Dutch declared their independence in 1881 in Transvaal. With the discovery of gold a new batch of fortune hunters came to this territory, but they were not given citizenship. This led to the Boer War of 1899. Even prior to the

outbreak of the war, when a batch of irregular troops led a raid on Transvaal in 1895 Germany resented it. The Kaiser sent the President of Transvaal, Kruger, a telegram congratulating him for repulsing the invaders. Britain suspected German conspiracy with the Boers. The naval enthusiasts of Germany pressed for further armament. This opportunity was exploited by all the other powers against Britain. Finally, when Britain was involved in the Boer War it was only Russia which proposed intervention while Germany kept quiet. As over Fashoda the European states drew back from war among themselves about colonial disputes, however much they hinted at hostilities.

X In like manner was the third, the Russian and British differences. Russian expansion brought her to the frontiers of Afghanistan and Persia. Fearing Russian expansion, an agreement was reached about the frontiers between Russian and Indian empires in the Pamir region in 1894. And when Persia came under the influence of both Russia and Britain, both the European powers signed a convention in 1907 defining their spheres of influence and erecting neutral zones between them. To some extent, the Anglo-Russian relations were strained when Britain started exploiting the oil that was discovered in Persia but relations were normalized during the war. In 1915 Russia agreed to British control over the original neutral zone.

X The fourth example was that of the pan-German and Pan-Slav Movements. In the seventies there was a movement for inviting all Slav people by extending Slavdom over Central Europe and large parts of Turkish empire. The Russians wanted to make use of it as a mask of their imperialism; whereas, the Slavs of the Balkans wanted to use it as a weapon against Turkey. Its counterpart was the Pan-German movement. The Pan-German League was supported by businessmen, bureaucrats and intellectuals.

It aimed at the union of all Germans in the world into one great German state with an enlarged Central Germany at its heart. It laid claim for the State to rule the world. The area claimed by them was the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburge, Austria, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Serbia and parts of Switzerland. In policy it was strongly anti-Semitic and anti-Slav. These two movements clashed over the Berlin-Baghdad rail-road initiated by a German bank. Britain welcomed the proposal. Even France offered to invest some capital. But the Russians were afraid of it and proposed that Germany, in return for her consent, should promise them control of the straits. The Germans refused the offer. Rebuffed like this, Russia concluded an agreement with Turkey in 1900 by which Russian consent was required for the building of rail-roads in the Black Sea of Asia Minor. This colonial rivalry worsened the friction between Germany and Russia, and thereby widened the gulf between the alliances in Europe.

★ The fifth colonial dispute was that of Russia and Japan in the Far East. The war was primarily colonial war and Japan came out victorious. The effects of this war on Europe were great. It encouraged the conclusion of an entente between France and Great Britain in 1904. Since the defeat of Russia was followed by an internal rebellion in 1905, the weakness of Russia was exposed. Germany heaved a sigh of relief: the nightmare of two-front war ceased to exist. But France felt more insecure by the weakness of her once certain ally. The Russo-Japanese war, therefore, intensified both German intransigence and French determination to find another ally.

★ The sixth dispute was over Morocco. France claimed special interests in this country as its own Algeria had frontiers with it. Britain had trading interests there. Germany in order to test the Anglo-French entente of 1904

decided to exploit the Moroccan question. Germany claimed that Morocco should be made independent. This irritated Britain and France as they had recently reached an agreement on the status of Morocco. France was made to yield to German pressure and an international conference was summoned. At the conference Germany found that only Austria supported her while Britain, Russia, Italy and Spain backed France.

An examination of all the six major international crises (the Fashoda involving Britain and France in 1898, the Boer War of 1899, the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907, the Pan-Slav Movement and the tension between Germany and Russia, the Russo-Japanese war of 1905 and the Agadir and Moroccan Crises of 1906 and 1911) preceding the First World War show that primarily political and strategic consideration, and not economic, that influenced the behaviour of the great powers. Even when strong economic considerations were there just as the French trading interests in Morocco or the British oil interests in Persia, all such considerations were kept subordinate to the political and strategic requirements of the day. When France supported the building of the Berlin-Baghdad railway, it was primarily because of financial considerations, but this could not mature as France was not willing to annoy Russia, a political consideration.

Thus, fears of national security and the desperate need for reliable alliances were so compelling that European powers did not permit colonial conflicts to influence their final decisions. "International relations were conducted mainly by diplomats of the old school and even many of the politicians were men who had been trained more in diplomacy than in statesmanship. Their dispatches show very little interest in economic conditions or social forces, and no understanding of the hopes of

ordinary folk, a more just social order, but only a profound absorption in the skilled game of power politics. Enshrouded in suspicions, alert to every sign of subtle shifts in the balance of power, they tirelessly and purposefully pursued the interests of their countries as they understood them; and they understood them almost exclusively in terms of alliances and counter-alliances, enhancing national security and power".

AFTER THE FIRST WORLD WAR

The relationship between the colonial powers and the colonies was based on certain principles: political dependence, racial inequality and economic subservience. This relationship varied from one empire to another. The British practice of preserving the native princes in India, or of indirect rule in Nigeria, the Belgium policy of preserving tribal communities in the Congo, or the French methods of making treaties with tribal leaders in North Africa, were all modifications needed for maintaining the imperialist hold.

On the other hand, the colonies underwent transformation in the 20th century. National awareness grew amongst the colonies and the nationalists started demanding an end to all the iniquities. This demand grew with the spread of westernization itself and it was nurtured by the liberal ideals of freedom, equality and self-determination as well as by the spread of education and industrialization within the colonies. The role of the colonial powers in the colonial revolution of the 20th century was no less important. There came a change on the part of colonial powers -- in their policies, attitudes and circumstances which weakened the will to preserve colonial relationships of the old pattern and compelled them to discover new relationships as trustees, partners or allies.

Significant advances in colonial government took place within the British empire and Commonwealth. The formal recognition of the concept of dominion status in 1931 implied the idea of equal partnership rather than tutelage.

Along with this change, the material base of colonialism was transformed. The League of Nations Committee in 1937 pointed out that the world's most important raw

materials of the colonies constituted only three per cent of the world's production, with certain exceptions like rubber and tin. In 1938, only 18½ per cent of Britain's imports came from her colonial territories, and the colonies took only 12½ per cent of Britain's exports.

True, these economic links changed less conspicuously in the case of other colonial powers like France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Portugal. Before 1914 France followed a policy of assimilation meaning the spread of French culture and civilization in order to make the colonial subjects little Frenchmen, but after the war the policy was changed to association, that is, showing greater respect for native traditions and ways of life while strengthening their economic and political links with metropolitan France. Still, this change in the French colonial policy was more theoretical than substantial. By 1938 France was drawing nearly one-third of her imports from her own colonies and sending nearly one-third of her exports to them. It was this reality that explains the violent outburst of colonial resistance to France after 1945.

On the other hand, Belgium, the Netherlands and Portugal were small European nations governing large colonial territories rich in natural resources. The Belgium administration adopted a paternalistic policy of progressive, social and economic development without any notion of partnership, responsibility or of eventual self-government. By 1939 Belgium Congo was shipping more than 80 per cent of its exports to Belgium, and deriving from Belgium nearly half of its imports.

The Dutch policy was also firm and paternalistic. But the Dutch recognized that they owed a moral obligation to the native people they governed. That is how the Indonesian nationalist movement began in 1908, but the partnership principle made little headway. Racial discrimination

and gross economic inequality rankled. There was virtually no middle class. This explosive situation explains the violence that loosened Dutch control over the territory.

The story of Portuguese colonialism was also the same. The Colonial Act of 1933 centralized colonial government in Lisbon. Trade was mostly under the control of Portugal. In 1931 the colonies were made overseas provinces.

And during the Second World War more changes came. The Brazzaville Conference was presided over by General De Gaulle in 1944. It recommended the development of local assemblies to voice colonial opinion, employment of natives in the public services, and direct representation of all colonial peoples in the French parliament. In 1956 the French Constituent Assembly ended the distinction between citizens and subjects in all the French overseas territories. Equally significant was the International Labour Organisation which met at Philadelphia in the same year. The conference issued a declaration which included universal equality of rights and status.

And after the war most of the colonies were liberated including those of the Portuguese in the sixties. The liquidation of the most characteristic of 19th century achievements — colonialism or imperialism -- was on all accounts the most far-reaching historical outcome of the Second World War. Indeed critics continue to maintain that there are neo-colonial tentacles of aid, transfer of technology and forming of global and regional blocs. Behind these tentacles lie the multi-nationals which primarily belong to the developed nations. To what extent the neo-colonial stance of aid, transfer of technology and global and regional blocs has been able to exploit the developing countries through the medium of multi-national is anybody's guess.

PAPER II : SECTION - B : SUB-SECTION-B

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

ANSWERING QUESTIONS

Questions on French Revolution can be set in various ways. One group of questions relates to the causation or the responsibility for the Revolution. The second group relates to aims, character and achievements. The third group relates to the National Assembly, the National Convention, and the Girondins and Jacobins. The last group can be very general like: why the Revolution occurred in France? or what was the revolutionary situation that preceded the fall of Bastille?

You can safely answer any question, provided you are thorough with the following topics: (a) chronology of the French Revolution, (b) Aims, Character and Achievements of the Revolution, and (c) Revolutionary Situation.

A CHRONOLOGY OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

1774 Louis XV on his death-bed remarked, "after me the deluge". The waters of the deluge gathered all through the years of Louis XV's reign. The royal funeral was hooted by the mob and drunkards sang ribald songs. The fortunes of the country were at the lowest ebb: discomfiture in foreign affairs, financial bankruptcy, increasing impudence of nobility and clergy, and the growing misery of the poor in society:

The crucial political problem of the reign of Louis XVI was that of restoring order and prosperity to national finances; and it was out of the unsuccessful attempts of successive ministers to solve this problem that the French Revolution was born. With good intentions Louis XVI restored the parliaments (consisting of eminent advocates and primarily courts of justice) while dismissing all the previous hangers-on. Immediately on his accession to the throne, Louis XVI called Turgot to the direction of national finances.

Turgot Turgot, as the Controller-General of Finance, checked extravagance in administration. As early as September, 1774, Turgot had established internal free-trade in corn, by the abolition of the whole network of barriers within France at which customs duties had hitherto been levied on grain. Thus, at one stroke, was removed not only an annoying hindrance to trade, but also one of the chief causes of the high price of bread. New impost on landed property while abolishing the obsolete corvee. Established internal free trade in corn and wine. Had various proposals in mind. Opposition mounted from nobles and clergy encouraged by the Queen. Dismissed before two years were over.

1776 Succeeded by Clugny who revived corvée, the guilds and the internal customs on corn and wine. Died soon.

1777 Necker succeeded Clugny. Honest, but timid and irresolute. France intervened in the American War of Independence which caused the financial break-down. Raised fresh loans but roused the hostility of the privileged classes.

The strain on the resources of the exchequer made Necker redouble his efforts at economy and, in order to inspire confidence in the Government and so to facilitate the raising of loans, he published a statement of accounts -- the famous compte rendu in 1781. This statement contrived, by misrepresenting the true condition of affairs, to show a balance of income over an expenditure of ten million livres. The Compte became at once a "best-seller": over 100,000 copies sold within a few weeks. Popular indignation was raised to great heights by the revelation it contained of the huge sums consumed by pensions to nobles. The latter, therefore, became furiously incensed against Necker. Their apprehension was increased by the very appearance of such a balance-sheet: hitherto State finances were a secret carefully guarded among a privileged few, and this divulgence of knowledge among the common folk seemed a precedent too dangerous to tolerate. It was resented by the Queen and the nobility. The friends of the Queen complained of Necker's miserliness. She demanded his dismissal and it was conceded in 1781.

1783 Calonne appointed Controller-General. Policy of extravagance in order to inspire confidence. His policy was the exact reverse of that of his distinguished predecessors. He contended that the

passion for economy was the surest way to destroy public confidence in the government; and he claimed that money would be easily forthcoming only when the nation, duly impressed by a luxurious Court, was satisfied that the Exchequer was in a flourishing condition. Calonne became the most popular of ministers, and money flowed in.

But the greater his immediate success, the surer was his ultimate failure. On the one hand, the unrestrained luxury of the Court meant greatly increased expense, while, on the other, the loans contracted with fatal ease involved the payment of interest which itself was an additional charge on income. Every year that passed thus brought final crisis more surely near. In August 1786, Calonne had to enlighten the King as to the true state of the national finances. At the same time he propounded a plan almost identical with that of Turgot, namely, that the privileges of the nobles should, in certain respects, be abolished and that there should be internal free-trade in corn. Unfortunately, a scheme which had once been quite feasible, had, by the extravagances of the intervening decade, been rendered impossible of achievement. Calonne's appreciation of the desperate nature of the situation was shown by his suggestion that the King should take the nobles into his confidence and appeal to them for help. The result was the famous Assembly of Notables which met first in February, 1787. This Assembly had no constitutional standing.

1787 Assembly of Notables consisting of chief nobles,
Assembly Bishops and magistrates. Hoped that they would
of consent to the taxation of the privileged and the
Notables unprivileged alike. Although the Assembly abolished compulsory labour on the roads and approved the

establishment of the provincial assemblies they condemned and opposed Calonne's land tax proposals as both unconstitutional and unnecessary and demanded his dismissal and recommended that the question of taxation should be referred to the States General, the ancient representative body of the French nation, which had not met since 1614. The immediate effect of nobles' resistance to the government was that the King influenced by the Queen dismissed Calonne in April, 1787.

Brienne, one of the leaders of opposition succeeded Calonne. Corvée abolished; provincial assemblies established; inter-provincial free-trade in corn (both accepted by Parliament). Like Necker and Calonne before him, Brienne was no sooner faced with the responsibilities of government that he was compelled to recognize that the financial projects of his predecessors were imperative of disaster was to be avoided.

He, too, presented to the Notables a shadowy version of Calonne's proposals - land tax levied on privileged and unprivileged alike. The Notables refused to oblige. Their Assembly was dissolved (May) and they went home, having demonstrated the firm determination of most of their numbers to prevent the King's Ministers tampering with their privileges, concessions and exemptions. The brusque refusal by the aristocracy to contribute to the national finances amounted to a revolt against and the defeat of the monarchy. The basic attitude of the majority of the aristocracy was now clearly revealed. Concerned with maintaining their fiscal privileges, they were hostile to any strengthening of the royal government.

Paris
Parlia-
ment

The land tax and other measures which the Notables had rejected now had to be presented to the Paris Parlement. The Parlement of Paris refused to register royal decrees for further loans or taxes. New series of royal edicts. Since the Parlement asserted that only the States-General could grant new subsidies, it was dissolved. Further resistance. It sounded like a revolution and the Parlement was abolished. Soldiers refused to arrest the judges. Excited crowds assembled in Paris clamouring for the convocation of the States-General. Confronted by the intransigence of Parlement and worried by fast approaching national bankruptcy and under pressure of the lay, ecclesiastical and judicial aristocracy, the king issued the convocation of the States-General for 1st may 1789. Brienne resigned and Necker was recalled to office.

States-
General

The Crown opened the flood-gates to the revolution by summoning the States-General. In effect, France was to be consulted what she wanted. This was in one way a huge concession by the Crown which had long evaded control or scrutiny by representative bodies. It meant, in fact, the abdication of absolute monarchy. The king took two important steps while convoking the States-General: (1) He prescribed that in the States-General the Third Estate should have the same number of representatives as the clergy and the nobility together thereby doubling the strength of the Third Estate; (2) and invited the people to list their grievances (cahiers).

The consequences of these concessions were far reaching than anticipated. The people and later the Third Estate saw in the grant of double

representation an implicit agreement that the three estates would sit together and vote their decisions "by head" not "by order". Since the 'implicit agreement' failed to become explicit this sparked off the revolution.

Invitation to prepare cahiers effected national debate on all national problems and issues. Three fundamental ideas - the idea of a declaration of rights, the conception of national sovereignty and the necessity of endowing France with a Constitution - emerged from this debate. The idea of a declaration of right in practice meant an end to all birth-based inequalities i.e. feudal order and also the grant of various freedoms. The idea of national sovereignty meant that the nation has precedence over every thing, and the demand for a constitution meant the refutation of aristocracy's contention that France already possessed a constitution. Significantly the cahiers clearly reflected the political and social conflicts which divided France.

1789

5th May, 1789: The opening of the States-General at Versailles. The government had no firm lead and did not present a comprehensive scheme of reforms. The main issues that the three estates would sit together and vote by heads, remained open and unsettled. There was evidence of division within the privileged orders since the Third Estate tried to win over the clergy to their point of view. The Third Estate right from the opening of the session exuded what might be termed the revolutionary spirit: a mixture of optimism, idealism, hope and excitement. They believed that their work was for the good of humanity in general as well as for that of the French people. The nobility

committed itself to a policy of no compromise. It was in this session that the latent (social and political) conflicts between the privileged and the imprivileged orders became patent. The Third Estate full of enthusiasm, expecting and prepared to follow a strong royal lead, was profoundly disillusioned on what it rightly regarded as the crucial issue (voting by heads) but the king sided the privileged orders. Only a union of the orders would give the Third Estate a majority and the possibility of passing the reforms it desired. It appealed to the king in the name of the national alliance of Throne and People against the aristocracy. Irresolute, as on many occasions, the king failed to respond to the emotions of his people; a failure which precipitated the event of 17th June, 1789 and subsequently the revolution. One clear sighted foreign observer summed up that "never was so noble an opportunity more completely lost by the king".

On 10th June the Third Estate gave a final invitation to the representatives of the other two orders to join them. This was refused, and finally, on 17th June, the Third Estate declared that, as the representative of the great majority of Frenchmen, it had authority to speak for the whole nation, and proceeded to call itself the "National Assembly."

Three days later, matters were pushed to a yet further extreme. On 20th June (1789) when the deputies of the Third Estate arrived at their Assembly Hall they found the doors locked and guarded by soldiers. Led by Mirabeau and Sieyes

the Commons proceeded to a public building used as a tennis court. Amidst intense excitement with upstretched hands they took an oath as members of the National Assembly.

The Oath of the Tennis Court was the declaration of the end of the absolute monarchy and the beginning of the popular sovereignty. The States-General was transformed by a simple proclamation into a National Assembly without the express command of the king. It also resolved that all taxes should be freely voted by the Assembly and any tax not sanctioned in such a manner should cease to be valid in all the provinces.

In the royal session of 23 June in which the king ignoring the Oath of the Tennis Court commanded that the estates should sit separately and vote by order proved to be the swansong of the ancient regime. The Third Estate, however, remained defiant and refused to obey orders. After the departure of the king, when the Grand Master of the Ceremonies, Breze reminded the members of the king's orders to disperse, Mirabeau replied, "Sir, go tell your master that we are here by the will of the people and nothing but bayonets shall drive us out." Bailly, who had been chosen as president of the Assembly supported Mirabeau and retorted, "The assembled nation cannot receive orders". The king after receiving the message said, "Very well, let them stay". Think of the king's reply. The commons had defied the king and the privileged orders. Some clergymen soon decided to join the Third Estate. Immediately after that a noise like thunder went up reaching the palace itself when the decision was known.

It was in this session that the monarchy sacrificed the possibility of alliance with the people and bound its fate to that of the privileged order. In essence the royal session was counter-revolutionary. In fact it was too late to make the old constitution work. The king could have made use of force, but he had no will or resolution to do so. His brother, the Count of Artois, remarked, "If you want an omelet, you must not be afraid of breaking eggs."

National Assembly

On 27 June (1789) when most of the clergy and forty-seven of the nobility had joined the National Assembly the king decided that he would have to give his approval to a measure which he felt no longer able to prevent. After the news was received that unless authorised joint meetings of all the three orders and that a mob of thirty thousand strong would besiege the palace, the king asked the remaining clergy and the rest of the nobility to join those of the National Assembly. Thus the king made enemies of men who might have been won as firm adherents of the throne had he been wise enough to grant as if by free will what the Third Estate got by force.

The first stage of the revolution was over and had been achieved without bloodshed. But while the National Assembly turned to the business of framing a constitution, the king turned to the army to save him from forces over which he was losing control. As troops converged upon Paris and Versailles the atmosphere in the capital and in the country grew even more tense.

Bands of ruffians roamed in Paris. There were also hot-blooded brigands from the south, tempted by the hope of plunder. The motley crowd was encouraged by Desmoulins, the greatest street orator of the day. At that juncture the king dismissed Necker.

By the 14th July, the Paris mobs collected arms -- muskets, two canons mounted on silver, and 50,000 pikes forged during the night. Then the rumour was set afloat that gun-powder was stored in the Bastille. The governor of the prison had very few guns which were primarily used for firing salutes. Hence, no defence was put up. The governor was dragged out while the prisoners were released: four coiners, two mad men and a murderer. The Governor's head was cut off by a cook's apprentice and was set upon a pike to be paraded in the streets. Women and children danced around it. The mob tasted blood. A few days later two ministers were brutally murdered.

These events introduced violence to support the assembly's decrees while rendering Paris practically independent of royal control. The new local government or commune was sustained by the popular militia called the National Guard, which was established immediately after the fall of Bastille. The king withdrew royal troops and recalled Necker. He recognized the new government of Paris and confirmed the appointment of Lafayette as commander of the National Guard.

The fall of Bastille reverberated throughout Europe and in France to led to burning of the chateaux. The collectors and financial agents, bishops and abbots, mayors and even peasants, who refused to join the rioters, were seized and their houses destroyed. Granaries were burnt. Records were destroyed. All authority was paralysed. And spontaneous anarchy was added to organize disorder. In the villages and towns, as in Paris, informal communal governments were set up. volunteer forces in provincial towns.

The seizure of the Bastille was the first -- and, for that reason, perhaps the most striking --

example of mob-impulse which was to find expression so repeatedly during the revolutionary period. The true significance of the event was that the people had openly challenged the royal power, and had been victorious: the symbol of the ancien regime had been destroyed. Furthermore, it marked the end of royal despotism. It completed the transfer of political authority to the national legislature. It paved the way for the fall of feudalism. It freed the country from the restraints of press censorship leading to the rise of popular journalism, the political effect of which was amply demonstrated by later events. It provoked the first emigration of the reactionary nobility, led by the count d'Artois, and set in train the forces that led, in time, to foreign intervention and war with Europe. The lawless citizens, by their audacity broke the force of the ill-proposed counter-revolution and thus saved the Assembly from extinction. It granted a dominant role to Paris to play in shaping the revolutionary course. In Paris itself there was a revolution in municipal government: power passed into the hands of the new Paris Commune and the National Guard. On this date the Revolution was baptised in violence and that violence ran all through the revolution; the September massacres of 1793, the Great Terror of 1793-94 and the blood bath of Thermidor were only speaks in a violent revolutionary landscape. "Thus out of a mighty lie, a new era sprang into life. Liberty was smirched at the very moment of her birth."

The king donned a red, white and blue cockade to signify his acquiescence in the recent developments. Had Louis possessed the art or the acumen he might still have deserted the privileged orders who were deserting him, have flung aside his empty

feudal title of king of France, and become the king of the French, but such a role was beyond his skills.

The National Assembly showed approval of the events of July 14. The king went to Paris to set his seal of approval. He was preceded by fishwives and market-women who danced before him waving branches adorned with ribbons. The king had even put on tricoloured brocade. Louis XVI agreed that a statue of him should be erected on the site of the demolished Bastille. Fashionable ladies bought the stones of the old fortress at so much a pound, like good meat. The peasant revolts became serious in the countryside in July 1789. Though the Assembly never fully approved peasant attack on private property, it was forced to make concessions and it was the scene of one of the most remarkable popular outbursts to which any national assembly has ever been subject. After 14th July, riots, burnings and general lawlessness became daily more widespread and intense.

On 4th August (1789) the Assembly was considering a report on the disorders raging throughout the country when, suddenly, the Vicomte de Noailles ascended the platform and proposed that, as the prevailing discontent was caused solely by seigneurial rights -- "the odious remains of feudalism" --, these rights should be forthwith abolished. Such a proposition, coming from a nobleman, produced upon the Assembly an indescribable emotion. The Duc d'Aiguillon seconded the motion which, at 2 O'clock in the morning, was carried by deputies who wept and kissed and cheered in turns. Serfdom -- with its customary feudal services -- hunting rights, feudal courts and the payment of dues to Rome were all

swept away at a stroke. The sitting closed with a vote that a national monument should be erected to Louis XVI, "the restorer of French liberty." The social revolution had been achieved within a single night.

The legislation of August 4 extended the scope of the revolution and added a social and economic programme to the political reforms. If one outcome of the August decrees was their liberation of France for capitalism, another was a re-routing of French life towards nationalism by overcoming its diversity.

The surrender of their feudal rights and fiscal immunities by the aristocracy and the clergy on the night of August 4, was not the product of spontaneous generosity rather an acceptance as a result of dread of what had already been seized by the peasants in the countryside. The peasant proprietors won their victory in 1789. So far as they are concerned the revolution was over: their role for the rest of its history was a purely passive one, except as in Brittany and the Vendee where they turned into active opponents.

The immediate response of the king to the August degree was to do nothing: he did not give them his sanction, thus raising in many minds for the first time questions about the proper role of the Crown in the legislative process as well as reviving the hopes of those who disliked the new France.

Constitu- tional Assembly

When on 9th July, 1789, the National Assembly assumed the title of Constituent Assembly, France was sorely in need of immediate and vigorous measures of government. The traditional methods of despotism had already broken down and, as the events of the succeeding weeks were to show, unless a thoroughly capable substitute for despotism was

These principles of 1789 were later to both enshrine and divide the whole of Europe. The bourgeois spirit of the document came out in the emphasis on property as 'an inviolable and sacred right' and on the necessity for compensation if property were expropriated. Economic and social equality were, significantly, not mentioned. Neither the rights of petition, assembly, association, education or poor relief. Nevertheless there is some justification in calling the document as the 'death certificate of the ancient regime'.

Before the Revolution had proceeded far, many perhaps most, of the items of the Declaration were shamelessly flouted even by the men who had so enthusiastically voted it. For to allow equal freedom to political enemies as to political friends was found to be inconvenient. Even then, throughout the following century the Declaration did remain a standard of liberty to be striven for in Europe at large as well as in France.

Not until Oct (1789) however, were the gains of the summer of 1789 consolidated. The King refused to accept either the decrees of August on the abolition of feudal rights or the Declaration of Rights, thus becoming a suspect of counter-revolutionary designs; he was furtively concentrating troops - there was news that the tricolour cockade of the Revolution was trampled under foot by royal troops - at the back of these inflammable rumours was hard reality of hunger to render men and women furious at a king who vacillated and an assembly which theorized while starvation stalked the streets. The people, prompted by radical journalists demanded that the king be removed from Versailles and the 'corrupt' influence of the court.

found, France would dissolve into chaos. Yet at this crisis, when the fate of the country seemed to be hanging in the balance, the Assembly spent precious weeks debating the theoretical "Rights of Man." The idea of enunciating man's elemental rights affords clear evidence of the influence of the American Revolution upon events in France: the document of 1789 was a deliberate imitation, in principle, of the American one of 1776. Moreover, the leader in framing its terms was Lafayette who had been so closely associated with the independence struggle in America. He was assisted by the Abbe Sieyes, Talleyrand, Bishop of Autun, and Mounier, all of whom were to achieve, fame, in various forms, during the ensuing years.

Not until 27th August - that is, nearly two months after the formation of the "Constituent" - was this Declaration issued. Its acceptance by the King did not take place until after the events of early October.

Declaration of Rights of man and the Citizens:

Nevertheless, the two-fundamental doctrines which gave the declaration its force as the gospel of the revolution were those of natural rights and national sovereignty. The rights to liberty, (of religion, speech and press) property (as inviolable and sacred), security and the right to resist oppression, were granted. No citizen was to be arrested or imprisoned except by due process of law and in the making of the laws which he had to obey he was entitled to participate directly or indirectly, since a valid law was the expression of the general will. It declared equality before the law, equal taxation and equal eligibility to office.

On 5 October 1789 market women set off on a march to Versailles. Some men dressed as women. The women kept screaming 'bread', 'bread'. Lafayette and his national guards marched at a respectable distance behind the women moving towards Versailles. At Versailles Lafayette became the man of the hour. He sent the soldiers back to the barracks and with his own force undertook to guard the royal family. Despite his precautions, a gang broke into the palace and killed several of the Queen's bodyguards. Early next morning they forced their way into the palace and clamoured for the king to return with them to Paris. Acting on the advice of Lafayette, Louis acceded and was forthwith accompanied to the capital by the mob, who declared that they were bringing "le boulanger, la boulangere, et le petit mitron" - the baker, the baker's wife and the baker's little boy.

The effects of this grotesque event were immediate, both within France and without. It was evident to all that the King was virtually a prisoner in Paris; and would be thenceforward much more under the influence of the revolutionaries than of his friends. This was perhaps the first step towards the interference of the king's friends outside France on his behalf; that is, it was the first step towards war.

Thus the king was brought to Paris so that he understood better the needs of his people and to do something to alleviate them, but before departing, the king was forced to accept the August decrees and the Declaration of Right. By noon October 6, ^{Louis} took up his residence at the Tuileries, in the heart of the capital. Thence forward he was to be a hostage of the people. Thus the people of Paris had again intervened at a decisive moment and

secured the consolidation of the gains of the Revolution. This removal from Versailles to Paris exercised a profound effect on the course of the revolution; for, the National Assembly considered it expedient to follow the king to the capital thus placing themselves directly under the influence of the Parisian mobs and their pikes.

In the October days the capital took possession of the king and the Assembly. For the next five years Paris was to dictate the course of the Revolution, and the Paris mob was to use a deadly tactic that would be employed by more than one party and to more than one end.

Thus revolution of 1789 was over by October end. Once the victory of the Assembly over King and aristocracy had been secured, France needed a period of social and political stability during which a constitution could be drawn up and French institutions reconstructed on Revolutionary principles. Much of the work done by the National Assembly in August-October 1789 was because of the influence of the mob: abolition of the privileges of the nobles, new system of local government, confiscation of Church property, issue of paper money, civil constitution of the clergy and a new system of taxation.

1790

The good harvest of 1789 meant that 1790 was a relatively calm year as far as violence and disorder were concerned. What conflicts there were tended to be sporadic and localised. So the Constituent Assembly was able to get on with its task of constitution-making. France was to be a constitutional monarchy, but the power of the king and his ministers was to be severely restricted. While the monarch could appoint ministers, they were to be responsible to the legislature and a decision to go

to war had to be confirmed by the Assembly. The latter had full control of financial legislation and the king was given only a four-year 'suspensive veto' over other legislation. Chances of a royalist coup were weakened by loosening the control of the king over the army and strengthening the National Guard under the aegis of local authorities. Power was to rest largely in the hands of the Constituent Assembly; total legislative power was augmented by much more than what was enjoyed by the legislatures of England and the United States.

In spite of article 14 of the Declaration of Rights, the suffrage was restricted, the right to vote being confirmed to 'active' citizens: those over twenty-five with residential qualifications and paying taxes to the equivalent value of three days unskilled labour. Almost a quarter of adult males were 'passive' citizens, excluded from voting. Nevertheless, this franchise was the most liberal in Europe at that time and more democratic than historians like Louis Blanc, Aulard and Mathiez believed.

Constitution-making was paralleled by administrative, judicial, financial and ecclesiastical reform. Nobility and titles were abolished; so were the old offices, though not without compensation for the owners. Hence the principle of the career open to talents was furthered. A new three-tier uniform system of local government was introduced, whereby departments, districts and communes replaced the jumbled medieval administrative map of the ancien regime. At each level, both councils and local government officials were elected by active citizens. To some extent the new structure marked the confirmation of a system that had already come into being and therefore represented collaboration with the

inevitable; for the municipal revolts of the summer of 1789 had effectively decentralised government. The loss of royal authority could not be regained by the Assembly in Paris, at least not in conditions of peacetime. France therefore became, in effect, a loose federation of departments and districts, with minimal control from the capital. In Paris itself the commune was to become the rival of the national legislature in 1792.

The complex, arbitrary and expensive judicial system of the ancien regime was also swept away. In tune with the Declaration of Rights, justice was to be free and men equal before law. New courts and tribunals were established at each level of local government, with a central court of appeal and, a rather sinister touch, a high court for cases of treason. Judges and magistrates were elected from a panel of qualified candidates; criminal cases were to be tried by jury. At a time when much of the latent savagery of the revolutionary situation had not yet broken the surface, some of the humane ideals of the Enlightenment could be put into practice: torture, branding and hanging were abolished. Capital punishment, retained after prolonged and intense debate, was to be by decapitation, a fate hitherto reserved for the nobility.

Financial stability was the most difficult problem facing the Assembly and one which it conspicuously failed to solve. Two loans were raised by the Assembly, but it yielded very meagre sums. New schemes were proposed but to no avail. That was how they went after the property of the Church. By a narrow majority a resolution was carried out to take over the property of the Church on 2nd November, 1789. In return the State assumed the

responsibilities of the Church for education and poor relief, as well as paying clerical salaries. The sale of the church lands created a new class of proprietors whose interest were bound up with the Revolution and who therefore were prepared to defend it against counter-revolution. Comparatively little of the Church land was sold in small lots, most went to those with capital: the middle classes and richer peasants. Significantly this nationalization of church lands did not rouse the opposition of the clergy to the Revolution.

Based on the property of the Church as security, notes, called assignats were issued. Originally they were mortgage paper but they soon became paper currency. They passed into everyone's hands and thus helped to establish the permanency of the new settlements. After 29th September, 1790, however, these instruments ceased to bear interest and became inconvertible paper currency with legal tender status. It was the over-issue of these paper notes in the effort to finance the war with Europe after 1792 which led to their depreciation and to the inflationary crisis of early 1793. This nationalization of Church property left the problem of making provision for the maintenance of the clergy.

This, in turn, led to the civil constitution of the clergy in August 1790 making the clerical opposition to the Assembly more bitter. The creation of a department for the Church was resented by the Catholic population. Finally when a decree was issued compelling the clergy to take the oath of allegiance to the State and the Constitution, trouble arose.

In November (1790) all office holding clergy, on pain of deprivation, were required to take an oath

to uphold the civil constitution marked a crucial point in the Revolution, for it meant the end of the period of national unity. This oath was refused by all except Seven bishops while half of the priests also refused it. The consequences were far reaching. The opposition between the constitutional and 'refractory' clergy brought into existence rival factions. The schism made counter-revolution practical by providing it with popular support in some areas. It further alienated Louis from the Revolution. Many peasants were turned against the Revolution for the first time; the emigres and henceforward suddenly acquired a conscience and popular support enjoyed a substantial measure of in France.

In certain districts, where devotion to the old Church was most intense, opposition to the Civil Constitution was one of the primary motives for civil war with which the Government had to contend at a critical period in its struggle with the rest of Europe. One other consequence, none the less important, of the civil constitution was its effect upon the attitude of the King. Louis XVI was a faithful son of the Church but he was compelled to sign the civil constitution. This stiffened his unwillingness to cooperate in the constitutional experiment. He became more definitely antagonistic towards the Revolution than he was before. It was Louis XVI's religious scruples, a constitution in papal denunciation of the civil constitution, which led him to the safety and the chance of a successful escape to the Eastern Frontiers of France. In June, 1791 he fled to

on of the clergy. This revolution, for it meant the end of the period of national unity. This oath was refused by all except Seven bishops while half of the priests also refused it. The consequences were far reaching. The opposition between the constitutional and 'refractory' clergy brought into existence rival factions. The schism made counter-revolution practical by providing it with popular support in some areas. It further alienated Louis from the Revolution. Many peasants were turned against the Revolution for the first time; the emigres and henceforward suddenly acquired a conscience and popular support enjoyed a substantial measure of in France.

tion to the old Church was most intense, opposition to the Civil Constitution was one of the primary motives for civil war with which the Government had to contend at a critical period in its struggle with the rest of Europe. One other consequence, none the less important, of the civil constitution was its effect upon the attitude of the King. Louis XVI was a faithful son of the Church but he was compelled to sign the civil constitution. This stiffened his unwillingness to cooperate in the constitutional experiment. He became more definitely antagonistic towards the Revolution than he was before. It was Louis XVI's religious scruples, a constitution in papal denunciation of the civil constitution, which led him to the safety and the chance of a successful escape to the Eastern Frontiers of France. In June, 1791 he fled to

with his family to cross the border, but was recognised, arrested and brought back to Paris. The consequences of this abortive flight were many.

In two respects at least it profoundly altered the whole situation. First, the king had been revealed as a deserter and a potential traitor to the nation and the Revolution - hence an immense wave of anti-monarchical feeling. Up to this point republicanism had never been regarded as a possible solution to the difficulties of French government. The republic of September 1792 was the direct answer to this flight. Second, the enforced return of royal family to Paris demonstrated to Europe that its members were indeed prisoners, and hence it spurred on the powers to intervene before too late. The power most immediately concerned was Austria whose ruler was the brother of Marie Antoinette. Thus the flight was a decisive factor in producing war between France and the rest of Europe.

Also, the nation had learnt the absence of the king had not wrecked the State. The Constituent Assembly was divided, but agreed on a compromise. The king was suspended from office but having given a pledge to accept the pending constitution, he was reinstated and the story was put out that he had been kidnapped by the enemies of the Revolution. It deepened political and social divisions within the Assembly and the country. The Paris Clubs and particularly the Cordeliers intensified their agitation for king's dethronement organising a demonstration in the Champ de Mars in Paris on 17th July, 1791. The demonstrators were 6000 strong; the National Guard desiring them to disperse opened fire killing many. It was a fateful episode which not only split the Third Estate irrevocably, but also won new recruits for a Republican movement.

In September (1791) Louis publicly accepted the constitution ignoring the emigres' advice to withhold his consent to it. By September the Constituent Assembly decided to disperse. The retiring members of the Constituent Assembly decreed themselves ineligible for immediate re-election, with the result that the new legislature was composed very largely of obscure men with little political training. Many of them were eager to win glory by destroying something - an ominous portent, since there was nothing great left to be destroyed except the throne. With the exception of the extreme Jacobins, all the parties in France desired war though for different reasons and aims.

The Constitution of 1791 was the first written constitution, only preceded by a few years by the U.S. The legislative authority was vested in one chamber. The members were elected by a complicated system of indirect elections. Public rejoicing welcoming the inauguration of the new constitution in 1791.

Consti-
tution
of 1791

The Legislative Assembly under the new constitution was elected in October 1791. Majority of them were moderate but a small minority held republican views. In this minority Girondins were more numerous. The smaller section of this minority was the Jacobins. The organization of the Jacobins was thorough. Hundreds of provincial clubs were affiliated to the parent body in Paris. This made them exercise greater influence than what their numbers warranted. In theory there was very little difference between the Girondins and Jacobins. The former were more refined than their rivals and held higher ideals. The latter relied for their success on brute force as supported by the Parisian mob.

Friction developed between the king and Legislative Assembly. The Assembly threatened to confiscate the land of the emigres assembling near the frontiers and threatened death if they failed to return. The king vetoed the decree (Dec. 1791). Also the decree against the non-juring clergy was vetoed by the king.

1792

The Girondins demanded that the Emperor should withdraw his troops even from the frontier and the emigres be expelled from his territories. Since no action was taken by the emperor, the Girondins made Louis XVI declare war in April 1792. The war lasted 23 years involving almost all European powers. The consequences of the war were many. It revolutionised the Revolution; it deepened the gulf between the moderates and the extremists that had appeared at the time of Varennes; it made the Revolution international and also more extreme for the sake of survival; it hastened the fall of the monarchy resulting in the setting up of the Republic; and it resulted into a five months' story of French defeat, humiliation, and invasion.

Louis' veto of decrees against non-juring clergy and of formation of a camp of 20,000 national guards at Soissons (the object being to overpower any force the court might employ against the Assembly) and dismissal of Girondin ministers on 12th June, 1792 led to angry demonstrators entering the palace. The king was forced to wear the cap of liberty and to drink to the health of the nation. On this day the prestige of the monarchy suffered irreparable damage.

The next event which had a marked influence on the progress of the Revolution was the issue at the end of July (1792), of a Manifesto by the Duke of

Brunswick, the Prussian general; he declared that he would punish the city of Paris if any injury or insult was caused to the king.

Panic gripped people. They became convinced of royal complicity with the enemy. They became suspicious of a counter-revolution. The tension mounted. A mob of Parisians and National Guards attacked the royal palace in Paris on 10th August, 1792. The royal family had already taken refuge in the chamber of the Assembly. King's Swiss Guards were massacred. Thus came an inglorious end of the French monarchy. It was formally abolished on 21 Sept. 1792, but 10 August was the real end. It was also the end of the Legislative Assembly, of Constitutional monarchy in France (until 1814), and of the constructive phase of the Revolution.

The consequences of this event were momentous. It turned the Revolution of 1789 to a new radical direction; integrated the people into a nation and marked the advent of political democracy; the Revolution itself received on this day a new master, the People, and with the people the Jacobins; and exacerbated antagonism between the Girondists and the Jacobins.

National Conven- tion

The Legislative Assembly which became a mere tool in the hands of the Paris commune (which itself was little more than a powerful Committee of Jacobins) suspended the king and summoned a National Convention to be elected on the basis of universal manhood suffrage. Meanwhile the Girondins were restored to the ministry.

During the sack of the Tuileries (royal palace in Paris) papers had been found which proved that Louis had supplied money to the emigres and to the counter-revolutionaries within Paris. This increased

people's fear of widespread treachery. Meanwhile the receipt of the disquieting news of the traitorous capitulation of frontier fortress of Longwy to the enemy on 23 August, 1792 led to an explosion of popular fury in Paris, which culminated in the September massacres of 1792 on news of the imminent fall of Verdun. Gangs of assassins visited prisons and put to death non-juring priests and other "suspects".

To fix responsibility for the hideous massacre is not easy. Merat, one of the Jacobin leaders was the prime mover; but every one else in Paris - the Assembly, the National Guard and the great body of citizens - acquiesced in the atrocities.

Before the end of September (1792) the enemy had been checked at Valmy and on the same day (20th September) the convention first assembled. The convention abolished monarchy and introduced many other reforms by unanimous vote.

Louis XVI was put to death on 21 Jan. 1793 for royalty itself was considered a crime and the king should die for being what he was, rather than for what he had done. Republic could never be stable while Louis was alive. This is how, most Jacobins argued. His execution deeply shocked the courts of Europe and made the new French Republic an outcaste among the nations; and almost all European powers declared war against France.

Immediately after the execution of the king, the Revolution was faced with a massive crisis involving military defeat and widespread counter-revolutionary rebellion. This crisis brought the conflict between the Girondists and Jacobins to a climax and consequently on June 2, 1793 the Tuileries, where the

convention sat, was surrounded by the 20,000 strong insurrectionary mob demanding successfully the expulsion of the Girondists because of their attacks on Paris as a centre of anarchy and disorder, their desire to be rid of the extraordinary revolutionary tribunal, their attempts to pin responsibility for the September '1792) massacres on the Jacobins and the Paris commune, their efforts to create a departmental (provincial) national guard responsible to the convention as a counter to the military power of the Paris sections, their opposition to the subsidised controlled food prices, their emphasis on the sanctity of property, and their belief that the Revolution was over.

*This incident gave a blow to property-owning and financial interests as well as the representative parliamentary government. The real power and the control of the convention passed into the hands of a fervent minority of Jacobins. Girondists appealed to the provinces to fight against this tyrannical few and most provinces took up arms and thus a civil war, born of politics, added to the civil war born of religion in the Vendee, began. The revolution was threatened from without and within France.

The Jacobin triumph was completed with the organization of the Reign of Terror. A Committee of Public Safety and the Revolutionary Tribunal acted against suspects in Paris while terror was spread to the provinces by Deputies of Missions.

While the terror was on, a good deal of useful work was done by the Convention although some of it was ephemeral. A system of education was planned. The laws were modernized and codified, a task which

*This was the third great revolution following 14 July, 1789 and 10 August, 1792.

was completed by Napoleon. The metric system of weights and measures was introduced. Attention was paid to the relief of the poor and the condition of agriculture. During this period the practice of Christian religion was restricted and Notre Dame became the Temple of Reason to worship Reason as the supreme deity. The use of Christian calendar was suspended and a new calendar was drawn up. New year was numbered from the establishment of the Republic. Months were named after natural processes -- a calendar which was discontinued only in 1806. In June 1794 Robespierre inaugurated the deistic cult of the Supreme Being.

And during the later parts of 1793 the plight of France was worse than what it was in 1792. The invasion of Holland failed. France was invaded by the enemies. Civil War had drained her strength.

1794 Driven to the Wall, the Jacobins organized a ruthless campaign against their enemies: Girondins and internal rebels, and against the non-juring priest and the emigre noble. Conscription was introduced. Appealed to the masses in the street. They taxed the rich. Guaranteed right to work. Fixed the minimum price of bread and regulated industry and trading. They also undertook the feeding of Paris.

By April stability was restored. From July onwards the Committee of Public Safety was reconstituted by Robespierre by excluding Danton.

Directory The Convention drew up a new constitution of
1795 France. To prevent the repetition of terror, authority was divided. The Directory, consisting of five members, were to hold office for five years, while one Director retired each year. Real power was in the hands of army generals. The legislature

was to consist of two chambers. The Council of Five Hundred was to propose legislation while the Council of Ancients was authorised either to accept or reject it. Further, to prevent the royalists from capturing the Councils, it was laid down that 2/3rds of their members should be elected from the members of the Convention. This new constitution was accepted by the people of France in a referendum, but very few people took part in the voting. The population of Paris attacked the place where the Convention was sitting, but a body of soldiers led by Napoleon repulsed the crowd with a whiff and grapeshot. This event proved decisive for the future. The mob of Paris which directed the course of revolution for years was dispersed and it lost its importance. The revolution was over.

The rule of the Directory lasted for four years. It was jealous of brilliant generals while being corrupt and weak. The Directory was overthrown in 1799. Napoleon first became a provisional Consulate and later its permanent Consulate. In less than 10 years' time the revolution was over.

Two loans were raised by the Assembly but it yielded very meagre sums. New schemes were proposed but to no avail. That was how they went after the property of the Church. By a narrow majority a resolution was carried out to take over the property of the Church on 2nd November 1789. In return the State assumed the responsibilities of the Church for education and poor relief, as well as paying clerical salaries. The sale of the church lands would create a new class of proprietors whose interest were bound up with the Revolution and who would therefore be prepared to defend it against counter-revolution. Comparatively little of the church

..../-

land was sold in small lots, most went to those with capital: the middle classes and richer peasants. Significantly this nationalisation of church lands did not rouse the opposition of the clergy to the Revolution.

Based on the property of the Church as security, notes were issued, called assignats.

AIMS, CHARACTER AND ACHIEVEMENTS
OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

Neither a new-born infant nor any great event in history would reveal its nature fully. What France witnessed from 1789 to 1795 was the birth pangs of a new human order. Neither the aims, nor the character, nor the achievements of the mighty process called the French Revolution can be easily summed up in a few phrases. What occurred in the form of storming the Bastille was the work of ruffians and robbers who were able to rouse the passions of the mobs in Paris. No contemporary thought that such an event heralded the birth of a new age in the history of mankind.

Talking of the aims of the French Revolution, no one can say that the philosophers did ever even remotely contemplate the cataclysmic changes that France witnessed from 1789 to 1795. For that matter even the cahiers that the deputies sent to the king did not foreshadow any of the great achievements of the later day. Some pleaded for maintaining a dog or a cat; some pleaded for more street lamps and more civic amenities. In spite of the queer content of the cahiers there is one running theme in all of them, and that being a hope for a new order which will end the galling inequalities of the day as sustained by an anachronistic social order.

It was this singular aim that made the deputies of the National Assembly compete with each other when they hacked down the whole feudal order on one momentous night. Then onwards the deputies went ahead with the reorganization of civil administration, reform of judiciary, and even aimed to reform education. In the meantime because of the absence of a legitimate and strong civil authority and prevalence of near anarchy in the provinces, the financial situation grew precarious. Since the Church

possessed one-fifth of land it was thought that they would be able to solve the financial crisis. In reality, the Assembly stirred the hornet's nest of the ecclesiastical problem. As things grew worse, more people fled the country and the European powers half-willingly challenged the authority of the new order.

The revolutionary armies were easily driven out and the Austrians boasted that they needed only whips, not swords, to punish the French. Driven to the wall, the revolutionaries in Paris tightened their control and instituted a dictatorship which reminded of the later-day totalitarian ones. During the period of republicanism all queer things were tried, like the rule of virtue, worship of reason instead of God and so on. None of these can be regarded as the aims of the Revolution.

In this process, however, the reign of terror unleashed a new elemental force which was destined to change the history of the whole world. It was the power of the people. It was the citizens' army inspired by the new faith that rolled back the invading armies of Europe. By the time the foreign armies left the soil of France, the good sense of the French prevailed since the extremists as represented by Robespierre and the Jacobins were eliminated from the stage.

Soon France attempted to find a new institutional set-up in the form of the Directory. But this attempt, too, was destined to fail as the elemental forces that were let loose after the storming of the Bastille on 14th July 1789 were too turbulent and too momentous to be contained and canalized in a constructive manner. Taking advantage of the critical situation, Napoleon made the best of the situation and ultimately installed himself as the emperor, making a mockery of the republican principles that were flaunted in the wake of the guillotining of the king.

After the defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo and the subsequent exile of Napoleon, the furies of Revolution were contained. Nevertheless the elemental forces that the Revolution unleashed caused periodic convulsions in Europe from 1815 onwards. It looked as though the passion of the French Revolution reached its consummation with the 14 points of Wilson. But as the peace-makers of Europe in 1919 continued to flout some of the principles of the French heritage like nationalism and self-government, Europe once again went through a period of mounting crises. These difficult times were further aggravated by other forces like ideologies, militarism and frustrated imperialistic ambitions. As these ingredients were interlinked with one another, Europe was led into the Second World War.

Also starting from the mid-19th century onwards as European colonization went apace, the aims of the French Revolution spread far and wide and became a part and parcel of the heritage of mankind. Even in the preamble to the Constitution of India, the three crucial words of the French Revolution, that is, liberty, equality and fraternity occupy a prominent place.

Talking of the character of the French Revolution to begin with, it was primarily violent, emotional and passionate since the human spirit in France was subdued and humiliated for a long period of time. The wrath of the French Revolution after 14th July 1789 fell on both real enemies as well as imaginary ones. Everything of the old order, be it functional or dysfunctional, was swept away.

As near anarchical conditions came to be sanctified in the name of the new order, with its own calendar and its own deity, the conservative forces of Europe joined hands to call a halt to the avalanche. Who could succeed against an avalanche? Led by the charismatic leader,

Napoleon, the Revolution baptized the whole of Europe in its new philosophy. Paradoxically, as the law of life would have it, Napoleon was at once the Revolution as well as the destroyer of it. During his time the Revolution once again became the personal greed and ambition of a single individual to establish hegemony over most of Europe. The very ideas that were preached by the French Revolution inspired the humiliated nations of Europe to muster their forces and courage four times to frustrate the aggressive designs of both the French Revolution and Napoleon. In the end the European nations triumphed and the ugly protruberances of the French Revolution were hacked down. Indeed the statesmen of Europe in 1815 felt that they had buried the monster. Soon events belied their hopes. Till the time European nations conceded the valuable heritage of the French Revolution there was no peace for Europe. The same thing was accepted and acknowledged by the colonial powers of the West by the mid-fifties of the 20th century.

In brief, the French Revolution started as a violent upsurge, step by step it became ruthless, ending as one-man dictatorship and later as the ambition of the one man to establish a traditional dynastic empire. Underneath the violence and the republican and monarchic ambitions of Robespierre and Napoleon lay the rich alluvium of the French Revolution. The constituents of this alluvium were liberty, equality, nationalism, popular sovereignty and secularism. These principles in course of time have been conceded by most of the nations in the world as they are today.

To sum up the achievements of the French Revolution, it pulled down the ancient order first in France, later in Europe, and still later all over the world. On the constructive side it was the French Revolution that passed on the rich heritage of liberty, equality, nationalism,

popular sovereignty and secularism for Europe and later to the whole world. And the French Revolutionary ideas can still be heard in southern Africa; the records of Amnesty International, the reports of Tarkunde, and the squeals of the innocent under the jackboot of security and integrity of nation over the world.*

AIMS (SOME DETAILS)

- (a) On the eve of the meeting of the States-General, variegated hopes were entertained by people ranging from the desire to keep a pet cat to the abolition of feudal order. Most of the cahiers expressed against the archaic practices and institutions and wanted more fairness in society.
- (b) The mobs instrumental for the attack of Bastille and the women who led the king to Paris crying for

* Please categorize them into internal and external. For enumerating the points on the internal achievements, sum up the work of the National Assembly, and the National Convention. Also refer to the short-term socialist measures sponsored by the Girondins and Jacobins during the period of the National Convention like the new calendar, a new religion and some socialist measures. You must finally mention the maturing of French nationalism.

Beyond France, you must refer to the spread of French revolutionary ideas like Napoleonic code, romanticism, secularism, liberty, equality, introduction of new tactics and strategy in warfare, and the emergence of popular national armies and the spirit of nationalism.

bread, were excited and emotional and they had no clear aims.

- (c) The peasants and artisans who attacked the old order and the provinces only wanted to end old injustices without clearly knowing what new things should replace the old order.
- (d) The members of the National Assembly definitely wanted the end of ancient regime and granting some freedoms for man and citizen.
- (e) When the foreign threat loomed large on the horizon the revolutionaries wanted to save themselves; otherwise, they had no specific aim.
- (f) The members of the Convention had certain rational aims as evidenced by their deeds.
- (g) The Republicans, in particular the Jacobins, wanted to establish a Republic of Virtue. Some of their aims like the ones relating to socialism were only meant for saving their skin.
- (h) The saner sections of the Convention wanted orderly government as evidenced by the constitution that brought the Directory into existence.
- (i) During the turbulent times from 1791 till 1795 various socialist measures were introduced but they were **only** meant for the sake of keeping the Parisian mobs in good humour.
- (j) The multiplicity of the aims and their surfacing up as the revolution progressed clearly reveal that the French revolutionaries had no blue-print when the revolution broke out. It was the latent forces of modernity in the Revolution that gradually crystallized themselves in the form of aims as the revolution passed through various stages. In

other words, the aims as they surfaced up as the revolution went apace, embodied the essence of modern outlook: equality, liberty, nationalism, popular sovereignty, and secularism.

CHARACTER (SOME DETAILS)

- (a) Frustration, despair, cynicism and sense of outrage against the inequities and injustices of society was the general temper of the French population before the summoning of the States-General.
- (b) With the summoning of the States-General hopes ran high and fortunately the National Assembly achieved some substantial results.
- (c) But the moment the National Assembly touched the religious problem the French Revolution became turbulent.
- (d) Earlier itself, after the fall of Bastille, anarchic conditions came to prevail in all the provinces of France since legitimate authority ceased to exist. After 1791, encouraged by the Paris Commune and the Jacobin club, the provinces established centres of tyranny. From 1791 to 1795 unscrupulousness and ruthlessness reigned.
- (e) From 1795 onwards the Revolution came to be monopolized by a single individual ultimately culminating in the emperorship of Napoleon.

REVOLUTIONARY SITUATION

Neither important people nor forces in France wanted a revolution in 1789. People wanted other things, but somehow they were sucked into the Revolution of 1789 since the situation was such. In other words, it was the revolutionary situation that caused the revolution but not any one single factor.

To connect the ideas of philosophers and the outbreak of the Revolution is futile as it was very remote. After all, they supported any absolute monarch, who was prepared to patronize them and adopt some of their teachings. The admirers of the philosophers were mostly aristocrats, lawyers business people, local dignitaries who were fairly happy and some members of royalty. It was only later that the ideas of the philosophers were used during the course of the Revolution to justify such measures that the philosophers could themselves have opposed. If at all the philosophers had any influence on the outbreak of the revolution, it was only to the extent that they fostered a critical and irreverent attitude towards the existing order. They made men more ready, when the need arose, to question everything.

The central part of the revolutionary situation in France was the king who was in desperate need of money. The expenses of the government rose while the costs of war could not be met. Indeed, there were many factors to avert cataclysm. France was a very large, populous, rich and powerful State. The peasants owned two-fifths of the soil. Paradoxically, these facts contributed to revolutionary situation. Since all the fairly well-to-do wanted to improve their lot they eagerly sought to improve the existing state of society.

By 1789 there was a growing demand for reform of glaring abuses, a more efficient and equitable system of taxation and administration, and a better system of government. The last thing that most of the people sought was a violent and brutal revolution.

Further, the government of the day was such that when the king tried to remedy the situation the whole thing went out of control. Every bishop was a nobleman. Members of noble families virtually monopolized the highest posts of government although they numbered only half a million out of a total population of 25 million. This was a sore point with the growing class of merchants, businessmen, financiers and lawyers, who were excluded from responsible and dignified offices in State and Church just because of chance of birth and social status. Added to this, the clergy and the nobles enjoyed so many exemptions from taxation while the burden of the State primarily fell on the middle classes and the more prosperous peasants. Thus, the summoning of the State-General gave the aggrieved an opportunity to make their social and economic weight politically felt.

Added to this, the king and his ministers were in no position to satisfy the expectations of the people. They had no courage to challenge the existing order. The right of the king to rule existed on the same foundation as the rights and immunities of the privileged order. To attack the privileges was to attack by implication every other part, including royal power itself. The king was in fact caught in a system that denied him autonomy and jurisdiction, but only obliged him to rule through the privileged order of society. His authority came not from God, but only from prescription, his power was not absolute, only arbitrary. In other words, the governmental machinery was archaic: an absolute monarch in theory, but in practice powerless.

Both the king and the queen, however, had the best of intentions. They gave up their gratuities so that they might not increase the burden of the tax-payers. The queen had given the whole of her personal allowance for the relief of the poor.

1. Helplessness of Louis XVI in getting right the finance of the country before summoning the States-General.

2. Played a double game with the States-General which was bent on mending the sorry state of affairs.

3. The king committed serious blunders yielding to the States-General becoming the National Assembly and later to the March of Women.

4. Foolish attempt to flee. At Varennes on 20th June in 1791 Louis XVI was held up by an improvised barrier of carts. There were a few royal troops in the town but the king chose to surrender himself. With tears in his eyes he embraced his accuser before the half-dressed crowd.

5. Because of his weaknesses and conscientiousness, the opponents of the revolution could not gather around him. He had to flee France and seek the help of foreign kings. Had he followed Mirabeau's advice and set up standard of revolt anywhere in France, outside Paris, or had he even, as Napoleon said, mounted his horse, he would have provided a focus of opposition to the revolution.

2. RESPONSIBILITY OF PEASANTS

1. Discontentment of the peasants before the summoning of the States-General was accentuated by the rise in prices and drought for a couple of years before 1789. The situation made the poor flock to Paris.

2. The peasants could buy and sell, go and come, choose a trade or a bride at will, and a large number of

them were remarkably thrifty in acquiring land. Since they were taxed according to external appearance of their wealth, they often concealed their prosperity by cultivating the appearance of poverty. One-third of the land was held by peasant proprietors.

Although the picture was bright enough, they had a number of grievances. Their estates were burdened. Their agricultural profits were very low. Their ambitions were checked. Capitalist agriculture remained in the hands of nobles, while the peasants had to lead a hand to mouth existence. In times of natural disasters, starvation faced them. They, too, felt the discrimination of society. Even on the scaffold inequalities existed: a nobleman was beheaded for a crime, but a commoner, hanged for the same.

3. Some of the peasants who were distressed migrated to towns. They were part and parcel of the riotous mobs in Paris from 1789 to 1794 - peasant revolts after the fall of Bastille, rioting mobs of Paris in July, the Women's March to Versailles, peasant revolts in La Vendee, etc.

3. RESPONSIBILITY OF THE MIDDLE CLASS

1. The bourgeoisie were prosperous, often highly enlightened and less burdened by feudal dues, but they were more aroused by religious intolerance and judicial abuses of torture during trial and inequitable punishments. The vanity of the middle class was hurt. This frustration and discontent was a vital ingredient in the revolutionary situation that prevailed before the States-General met.

2. A large number of the Third Estate were middle-class people, particularly lawyers.

3. In the legislative assembly, that came into existence in 1791, the middle class were large in numbers.

4. The factions which clashed from 1791 onwards, ending in the Directory of 1795, were composed of middle class members mostly lawyers. Some of the middle class members like Marat, Danton and Robespierre were instrumental for the reign of terror.

5. Indeed, they were the beneficiaries of the Revolution.

(a) The abolition of feudal, clerical, provincial corporate, municipal, guild privileges and internal customs systems and monopolies coupled with a law forbidding association for the protection of their interests by workers, rationalization of tax-structure and the introduction of new and uniform system of weights and measures, liberated France for capitalism reducing State intervention in economic affairs to a minimum thus ensuring free trade, free enterprise, free exchange, free contract, free competition, free market all pre-requisites for capitalist i.e. bourgeois progress. In fact the French Revolution liberated the individual from age-old fetters to devote his energies to his development in a free manner without which capitalism would not progress.

(b) The Declaration of Right of Man clearly reflects the bourgeois spirit by emphasizing on property as 'an inviolable and sacred right' and on the necessity for compensation if property were expropriated.

(c) The 1791 Constitution was the work of the bourgeoisie. It was explicitly rooted in the

defence of property which was not only a right, but also a basis of electoral and suffrage qualification.

- (d) After the relics of feudalism were destroyed and the royal powers reduced and subsequently monarchy abolished, the bourgeoisie was left supreme in the State.
- (e) Even the sale of confiscated church lands benefited them. The poorest peasants and day labourers were in no position to profit by this unusual opportunity. It was only some well-to-do farmers or some middle class men who purchased the land.

The bourgeoisie wished the revolution to end when the control of the government had passed from the absolute monarchy and the feudal classes into their hands. Almost from the first an inner conflict between bourgeoisie and classes without wealth or property checked the progress of reform measures. There were many revolutionary enthusiasts for whom a political revolution was not enough; they wanted a social revolution which would extinguish property by distributing the property of the wealthy among the poor. Against such egalitarian doctrines the bourgeoisie fought relentlessly during the internal revolutionary period, asserting at every opportunity that private property must be considered sacred and inviolable.

4. RESPONSIBILITY OF GOVERNMENT

Portray the archaic nature of the Government before the summoning of the States-General. The government being what it was, it failed to solve the critical problems faced by the country. The moment the States-General met and declared itself as the National Assembly, the old

government was brought down. You have to confine yourself primarily to the archaic nature of the government before 1789.

1. The administration of the government was a scandal. A hierarchy of royal officials appropriated the administrative powers. Many of the jobs were sinecures. Funny jobs were created like "beer-taster of Paris", "controllershship of wigs" and "hereditary jury incharge of burials". Whenever royal ingenuity and the treasury were exhausted, honours and municipal rights granted by the previous king were revoked, and then resold. This unparalleled confusion in the administration was magnified by the sale and resale of offices, by the accumulation of arrears of work, and the fussy and capricious directions from the headquarters.

2. Regarding law too, there was no uniformity. There were nearly 400 different customs. What was lawful in one town, may be illegal in a place not far away. There was no guarantee of personal liberty, no habeas corpus act. The government was ridiculously arbitrary too. If a person shocked the king or offended an influential nobleman or clergyman, he might be thrown into prison and there detained indefinitely without trial by a royal order called lettre de cachet. There was neither simplicity nor uniformity in the standards of weights and measures, coinage, tolls and internal custom duties. It was remarked that no one was so exalted as to feel safe from the ill-will of a minister, and the pettiness and meanness of a clerk.

3. The tax structure was not only oppressive but very arbitrary. In a secret session of the Royal Council they could be increased since it was believed that revenue was a part of king's private account. Far worse was the manner in which taxes were assessed and collected.

They were assessed mainly on the under-privileged classes of peasantry and the bourgeoisie. In collecting the taxes the government often empowered private corporations and individuals (farmers of taxes) to monopolize the collection of taxes while allowing them to retain a big share of what they collected.

4. While the government, administration, tax system and the legal system were so absurd, there was censorship both by the State and the Church.

5. Regarding finances, no distinction was made between the king's income and the national income. No budgeting. Money was spent by the king or his agents as fast as it was collected. There was no parliamentary criticism.

5. RESPONSIBILITY OF PHILOSOPHERS

In a land of no parliament the men of letters and philosophers became the politicians. In a society of malcontents, the writers enthused the people to voice their grievances, and gave leadership and faith to them. The philosophers demonstrated the rottenness of the country in various ways: satire and wit, criticism and comparison, scientific exposition, sociological theory, and down-right abuse.

Amongst the thinkers, Voltaire did the greatest damage to the authority of the Church. In a way he ridiculed everything. A satirical remark landed Voltaire in the Bastille, while a repartee brought him a thrashing from a nobleman's servant. He was the honoured guest of Frederick the Great, but left the Prussian court with anger while stealing his patron's poems: for the theft he was seized and imprisoned by Frederick.

- 137 -

Rousseau was different. He roused the sentiments and emotions of people. Rousseau began where Voltaire left off. The latter harnessed the horses of reasons; whereas, the former unchained the tigers of emotion.

One more thinker was Montesquieu who made an impassioned plea for liberty and advocated separation of powers as an effective check against arbitrary government.

But the thinkers were careful in not carrying their criticism too far. They knew well the art of saying everything without being sent to the Bastille. The literature of the day was dominated by generalization and emotionalism, abstract theory and extreme logic, by formulae and sentimental analogy, all of them proving a poor basis for constitution making. Never before any revolution was so flooded with words and phrases.

1. No philosopher directly participated in the revolution. The ideas of the philosophers were fairly widespread particularly amongst the middle-class. Not only many of the nobility and the clergy but even some of the sturdy farmers and thrifty artisans imbibed the ideas of philosophers.

2. The Cahiers were not revolutionary in wording. All expressed loyalty to the monarchy. However, in spirit, most of them reflected the day's radical political philosophy, and demanded fundamental and rational reform of government and society. Furthermore most of them insisted on removal of social inequities and abuses.

3. Much of the constructive work done in the revolutionary era till the establishment of the Directory, was inspired by the philosophers.

4. The liberation of the peoples' emotions and passions owes much to the thoughts of Rousseau. It was

.../-

he who idealized the common man while despising both the bourgeoisie and aristocracy. To him sentiment, feeling and emotion were more important than reason. He was such an idol for the common man that people in Paris stood in queues to drink coffee from the same cup from which Rousseau earlier had drunk. Indeed as the irony of fate would have it, Robespierre claimed himself to be the General Will — according to Rousseau, the General Will should be the absolute sovereign in a State.

6. ACCOUNTING FOR 1789

For this question you have to carefully narrate the chronology from the time the States-General met till the fall of Bastille. After narrating the chronology you should portray the revolutionary situation that was behind the emotional and violent outburst which led to the fall of Bastille. You should also mention that Revolution began with the fall of Bastille and it was over with the establishment of the Directory in 1795.

WORK OF THE CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY

(a) Abolition of privileges. On August 4, the Assembly took up the question of privileges. The members were caught in a delirium of competitive generosity and legislative hysteria. All gave away what they could, either of their own or of their neighbours'. Nobles renounced their dues, bishops their tithes, provinces their privileges, towns their immunities. Thirty decrees were passed on one night abolishing serfdom, feudal jurisdiction, manorial rents, game laws, saleable offices, clerical fees and municipal and provincial rights.

(b) Declaration of the Rights of man. On the 12th August, the Declaration Rights were proclaimed for all men, for all times, for every country and as an example to the whole world. The Declaration ended with the assertion that since private property was a sacred right no one shall be deprived of their property except when public necessity demanded and when it was legally determined.

(c) New system of local government. Intendants were abolished. The old provinces were dismembered. Eighty-five new departments and elective councils were established. "The disorganisation of kingdom could not have been better planned", said Mirabeau. The executive authority was weakened, preparing the way first for local tyrannies of the informal communes, and finally for the terror of 1793 and the dictatorship of Napoleon. (d) New Judicial system. (e) Confiscation of Church property. (f) Civil construction of the Clergy — reorganization of the Church in France as a department of State. (g) New system of taxation. (h) Issue of paper money. (i) Passed 25,000 decrees and framed a Constitution.

We may conclude here our brief summary of the work of the National Constituent Assembly. If we review it as a whole we are impressed by the immense destruction

that it carried out. No other body of legislators ever demolished so much in such a brief period. The old form of government, the old territorial divisions, the old financial system, the old judicial and legal regulations, the old ecclesiastical arrangements, and, most significant of all, the old conditions of holding land -- serfdom and feudalism -- all were ended. The guilds, too, were destroyed, and combinations of workmen were prohibited.

Yet all this destruction was not made on the spur of the moment. It had been preparing slowly and painfully for several generations. It was foreshadowed by the mass of well-considered complaints in the cahiers. It was achieved not only by the decrees of the Assembly, but by the forceful expression of the popular and national will. And out of the destruction emerged the individualist, democratic, nationalist State of the future.

•

NATIONAL CONVENTION

All through the period of the Reign of Terror, the National Convention pursued radical and social objectives and even socialist policies in economic matters. Although the Convention was neck deep in foreign wars and the squabbles of the Girondins and the Jacobins, some of its achievements became the heritage of France.

Firstly, the property of emigres was confiscated for the benefit of the State and the lower classes. Large landed estates were broken up and offered for sale in small parcels and on easy terms.

Second, regarding ~~xxx~~ education, it proposed that the French language should be the sole language of national instruction.

Third, it passed certain basic social reforms like the abolition of imprisonment for debt, protection of women's claim to property just as man's, and abolition of Negro slavery in the French colonies.

Fourth, it adopted a revolutionary calendar. The five or six days left over at the end of the year were declared as national holidays.

Fifth, it established a new and uniform system of weights and measures.

Sixth, under the auspices of the Paris commune an atheistic religion of reason was formally inaugurated in the Cathedral of Notre Dame in November 1793. Later in July, 1794 under Robespierre's guidance the deistic cult of the Supreme Being was officially substituted for the atheistic worship of Reason.

In the end we have to mention that ornate clothing went out of fashion. The silk stockings and knee-breeches (culottes) of the old regime were mostly supplanted by the plain long trousers which had hitherto been worn by the lowest classes of workmen (sans-culottes).

GIRONDINS AND JACOBINS

In the Legislative Assembly that came into existence in October 1791 there were large number of lawyers and many of them new to politics. They were all dazzled by dreams of unprecedented opportunities.

To the right of the Assembly sat Feuillants and the Constitutionnalists who, ironically, were the left of the National Assembly. And to the left of the Legislative Assembly sat the Jacobin extremists and revolutionaries. From this segment a group gradually distinguished itself. The first group to make itself prominent was the Girondins as most of them came from Gironde. They were political experimentalists. Some historians view them as tragic idealists or sentimental windbags. They were full of theory and zeal. They possessed marvellous eloquence. They identified themselves with the heroes of antiquity. Their gods were Brutus, Aristides and their evangelist was Plutarch. They were demagogues and they had no forethought. There was not even a single practical statesman amongst them.

Such being their nature they wanted to strike a blow for the revolution by pulling down some part of the old edifice. This made them to embark on a policy of provocation. The two prominent enemies at that time were the emigre nobles outside France, and the priests within who would not take the oath to the Constitution. The Girondins heartily denounced them as fomenters of disturbance and friends of the king. They passed decrees sentencing to death all the emigres who had not returned to France by January 1792. Then they ordered the priests to take the oath within a week under penalty of forfeiture of their livings and pensions.

The question of the Church touched the conscience of Louis XVI. He vetoed both the decrees. This was exactly what the Girondins desired and prepared for. They wanted to accuse the king as a traitor. For this purpose they precipitated the foreign war. At that time the Feuillants and the Monarchists too wanted war since they thought that it would strengthen the executive. Only the extreme Jacobins broke away from the Girondins and opposed the war since they feared that war might lead to a regenerated monarchy or a dictatorship.

By then, the foreign powers also added enough fuel to the fire. The declaration of Pillnitz and the manifesto of Coblenz denounced the revolution and threatened to destroy Paris. This created a war hysteria in Paris. The king was made to declare war against the King of Hungary and Bohemia in April, 1792.

In the streets of Paris the people acclaimed the declaration of war with delight, but the French troops suffered serious reverses. The Three columns sent to Austria and the Netherlands were routed. Lafayette was forced to retreat. The spectacle was ridiculous and humiliating. The Austrians laughed and said: "We need no swords, but whips." Unfortunately, the Austrians lingered thinking that victory was certain. And Prussia declared war late in July, 1792. Then the combined troops of Austria and Prussia led by Brunswick invaded France. Paris was only a fortnight's march away.

By then, the foreign powers wasted three months which led to momentous consequences within France. Facing defeats, both the Girondins and the Jacobins set the forces working against the king. The mob broke into Tuileries and forced the king to drink sour wine and put on a red cap on his head. After the Brunswick manifesto

of July, the Parisian mobs became more violent. The king was brought before the Assembly on 10th August. All his functions were suspended and he was handed over to the insurrectionary commune of Paris.

Faced with the situation, the Legislative Assembly summoned the National Convention to decide on the king's future. With the summoning of the Convention in September 1792, the revolution in one sense came to an end. On 21st September, the Convention voted for the deposition of the king. By then, the advance of the enemy was checked. This emboldened the Convention to send the king to the guillotine.

In the meantime a civil war of spasmodic nature broke out in France, particularly in Brittany and La Vendee. There also broke out civilian revolts in many towns. All these revolts lacked in direction.

Meanwhile the French suffered reverses in the early months of 1793. The Girondins became unpopular. By the end of May, the Paris mob broke into the Convention and a number of Girondin deputies were arrested.

The Jacobins became triumphant. The Jacobins advocated direct democracy and championed vigorous national defence against the forces of counter-revolution.

Robespierre was a leader of genius but with an extraordinary fixity of purpose. He was slight built, bespectacled and an unglamorous figure. He was the archetype of the provincial lawyer, who dominated the revolutionary assemblies. He was the little man of humble origin made great by the upheaval of revolution. He stood for all the word Jacobin stands in modern history: doctrinal idealism, exalted sovereignty of the people, liberty, equality and fraternity of all men, and one indivisible national republic. He was ruthless and

fanatical. He dominated the Convention from July 1793 till July 1794, when he died at the guillotine.

The Committee of Public Safety and the Committee of General Security were the two instruments through which Robespierre functioned. The first was entrusted with wide discretionary powers of government and the latter was concerned with police functions. After the expulsion of Danton, Robespierre joined the Committee of Public Safety. From August 1792 the special court called the Revolutionary Tribunal existed in Paris which was originally meant to try political offenders. Now, it became the convenient means by which the government could bypass the regular courts.

The Reign of Terror became possible because all the familiar forms of government ceased to exist while the country was menaced by counter-revolution at home and invasion from abroad. Seventy per cent of the victims of the terror belonged to the peasantry and labouring classes, mostly in rebellion against the State. There were summary massive executions in Vendee and Lyons where there were open rebellions against the Convention. In the beginning the victims of the terror were aristocrats and priests, but soon it spread to wealthy men and ultimately to those who had inspired the terror itself, including Danton and Robespierre.

Conscription was introduced by the Committee of Public Safety in August 1793 on the advice of Carnot, who revolutionized modern warfare. He transformed war from battles between armies into a conflict between nations.

By June 1794 the tide turned in favour of France. The rebellion of the Vendee was broken. The Prussian and Austrian forces were driven out of Alsace and Lorraine. All Belgium was occupied by France. Relieved

by foreign pressure, some of the members of the Convention turned against Robespierre. After the guillotining of Robespierre, 80,000 prisoners were immediately released in July 1794.

A sorry feature of the Reign of Terror was the wretched quarrelling amongst the various factions of the radicals. In 1794 Danton along with his friend, Desmoulins, was guillotined. Robespierre, who endeavoured to establish a republic of virtue, was sent to the guillotine by the more conservative members of the National Convention in July 1794.

Thus ended the last scene of the French Revolution on a sad note. As a matter of fact, the French Revolution and the Napoleonic eras were a little abnormal. The symbolic gesture of the solidarity of the democratic international, when Lafayette, the hero of the United States and newly appointed commander of the National Guard, handed to Tom Paine, the republican English hero of America, the key of the Bastille to be given to George Washington and ever so many romantic episodes, punctuated the history of this period. One should not be carried away by them. It is certain that 19th century would have been a period of profound change and great expansion even without these two happenings. [American independence was won before the French Revolution began. The tide of radical and democratic opinion was strong and forceful in both Britain and America even before the French Revolution. The Industrial Revolution, irresistible in its impetus, had begun. The revolutions in sciences and in culture, at the very root of 19th century changes, were already well advanced before 1789. The romantic movements in art and literature preceded the Revolution and they did much to shape its character.] "In the longest perspectives of

history, even the most shattering political, military, and diplomatic events of the period seem but limited factors among the many that mould the history of man. The men who shaped Europe's future were not only the leading participants in these heroic events but also men such as Antoine Lavoisier and Adam Smith, James Watt and Jeremy Bentham. When the thud and smoke of gunfire had died away, more permanent forces of human destiny could be seen, shaping nations and states and the fate of individuals.

Perhaps the final significance of the quarter-century of turmoil is that too much history happened in too short a time. The old order would have died anyhow, but it could have died more slowly and peacefully. The explosion of pent-up forces in revolution, the long agony of wars, the dynamism of successive forms of dictatorship, the prodigies of empire, were all so congested in time, and overlapped so closely in their happening, that they mangled and disrupted the processes of historical change."

WHY REVOLUTION IN FRANCE BUT NOT IN ANY OTHER COUNTRY?

Exploitation of people and arbitrariness of the Power That Be was the common characteristic of States in Europe except, for Britain. It is also intriguing to learn that France had a big population, wealth and strength as compared to almost all the countries. The peasants were not as wretched as some of their counterparts in Prussia, Austria, Russia and a few other States. Two-thirds of the land was owned by them.

In spite of so many plus points the Revolution occurred in France primarily because of anachronistic government and administration, the presence of a large number of intellectuals with incisive minds, volatile temper of the French, the near bankruptcy of the State by 1789, the impossibility of restructuring the governmental machinery, and the total incompetence of the good-natured king, Louis XVI. A combination of all these special features can be termed as the revolutionary situation in France and its absence in other countries that holds the clue for the occurrence of the Revolution in France.

Some Details

- (a) The unprivileged classes in France toward the close of the 18th-century were on the whole better treated than in some neighbouring States. But for this very reason they were less disposed to tolerate abuses and less willing to wait indefinitely for the reforms which their leading thinkers had propounded so attractively and with so much brilliance and conviction.

- (b) The professional and business classes, the bourgeoisie, though most enlightened and most progressive and prosperous elements in the nation (unlike other States) being denied a commensurate social and political status, hated the system which bestowed on men the "privileges" and "precedence" on the basis of their noble birth.
- (c) France being geographically very close to Britain was influenced deeply by the British liberal ideas (particularly that of Lock's). The Frenchmen were aware of the British historical developments like the Civil War and the Glorious Revolution.
- (d) The American Revolution and the French support to it profoundly affected France economically and more important by stirring her people's mind to aspire for a new social order (Cahiers reveal this).
- (e) The revolution in France was set in motion by the reactionary aspirations of the aristocracy which had for long outlived its utility but had retained all ancient privileges and immunities. It was determined to defend its own fiscal and political privileges as the events of 1787-88 prove amply. The political crisis of 1787-88 revealed clearly to a hitherto unorganised magnified middle class the need to defend its interests against aristocratic reaction and stimulated its political consciousness.

ROOTS OF GERMAN AND ITALIAN NATIONALISM

Every nation has its own distinct national characteristic or trait. Such differences are primarily because of the social milieu that varies from country to country and from which the feeling or sentiment of nationalism emerges.

Scholars have attributed various contributory factors for the emergence of nationalism like language, race, religion, living in a distinct geographic area, and common heritage or history. Out of these basic factors, common heritage or history is the most important because sentiment or feeling of oneness is the dominant feature of nationalism of any community or people. Whenever a people take pride in this common heritage or history for a long period, the national feeling of that community tends to be more rational and sober. In this context, however, it is to be remembered that national sentiment or feeling alone is never the motive force behind a nation's external policies. But nationalism is indeed one of the factors in influencing the external affairs of a country.

Talking of Germany and Italy, the one force which gives a peculiar colouring to the national sentiment of these two countries is the spirit of romanticism. The pioneer of romanticism, Rousseau maintains: "A thinking man is a deproved animal". The statement is revealing because the chief characteristic of romanticism is feeling or sentiment which leads to faith, reverence and veneration. How the romantic spirit went into the making of German and Italian nationalism is borne out by Goethe, Schiller, Kant, Hegel and Beethoven in Germany and Mazzini in Italy. The romantic version of nationalism in Germany is far more deeper than that of Italy because in later days the non-rational approach to reality and truth was further augmented by the writings of Hegel, Trietschke, Schopenhauer and Nietzsche. On the other hand, the romantic nationalism of Italy is of a surface level because their national sentiment often appears in the form of sporadic

emotionalism and sentimentalism. Even during the days of Mussolini it could not strike deep roots because of the very temperament or national character of the Italians as well as the economic imbalance between northern Italy and southern Italy.

The nationalism of Germany acquired teeth from the very beginning as it was born under the hoofs of the Napoleonic horses. Reacting against the exactions and the ruthless domination of foreigners, the German nationalists attached tremendous value to local institutions, native ^{customs}, traditional culture and national language. As opposed to French nationalism, which was cosmopolitan, universalist and anti-nationalist, German nationalism was romantic, particularist and exclusive in character. Immediately after the disaster of Jena in 1806 the German army was reorganized by Scharhorst. A German wrote to the Prussian king in 1807, "We must do from above what the French have done from below". The patriots of Prussia were struck by the endless forces not developed and which still slumber in the bosom of the nation. They set about building a strong central authority, a truly national army and a system of national education to infuse patriotic reverence for German heritage, and evotion to the cause of German nationalism.

On the other hand, the French domination of Italy was for a long period and it was more acceptable. Middle-classes in the towns welcomed the greater efficiency and the weakening of religion which came in the wake of the demolition of the power of the petty princes and of the Pope. That was how the chief exponent of Italian nationalism, Mazzini, was an idealist and a pure intellectual. He hoped everything from the youth. He said, "place the young at the head of the insurgent masses". The idea of freedom and unity spread to outside countries also, with the result that societies called Young Poland, Young Germany and Young Switzerland were formed on the model of Young

Italy. Further, he did not regard the notion as an end in itself. Nationalism was to Mazzini the God-appointed instrument for the welfare of the race, and the means of a wider service to humanity. Such being the nature of nationalism in Italy, it was only the voice of new Europe; whereas, the genesis of German nationalism being different, it became the menace of Europe.

Another striking feature of nationalism in Germany and Italy resulted out of the way in which Germany and Italy came to be unified as independent notions. Blood and iron as well as coal and iron decided the fate of German nationalism. Through a series of Machiavellian wars, Prussia unified the German states. It ultimately resulted in giving a peculiar Prussian stamp to the German sense of nationalism. Prussia always stood for authoritarianism. The founder of Prussia, Peter the Great practised marksmanship by shooting at the lobes of people in the streets. Another feature of Prussianization was the Junker tradition, that is, the authoritarian tradition of the rich landlords in Prussia. This authoritarian feature, combined with the romantic inspiration which came in the wake of the French Revolution, made German nation aggressive, chauvinistic and ultimately militaristic.

The Italian nationalism, too, reflects a diluted version of the same characteristic feature. At every stage the Italian statesmen exploited the European crises to unify the Italian states. Diplomacy played a greater role than arms in bringing about the unification of Italy. Logically, Italian nationalism is aggressive and militaristic only in fits and starts but never as deep-seated as that of Germany's.

One other factor that went into the making of nationalism was mercantilist and the later-day capitalist developments in Germany and Italy. Italy lost its lead in the mercantilist trade when the centre shifted to Antwerp and to the countries

that are located on the Atlantic sea-board. At that time, the Fugger family took the lead in organizing a network of banks, insurance companies and stock exchanges in Antwerp. Moreover, at every stage of German unification the economic interdependence of the German states acted as the material lever for the unification of the country. But the time Germany was unified it was the economic network that bound the nation together and thereby giving to German nationalism the characteristic feature of aggressive economic nationalism. It is interesting to note that one of the reasons that made the Germans rise against Napoleon was the dissatisfaction of the Germans at the non-availability of sugar for their coffee! The peoples' Army of Prussia was pitched against the peoples' Army of Napoleon at the battle of Leipzig otherwise known as the Battle of Nations. Since the German nationalist had the skeletal framework of capitalism, Germany sought colonies for more markets and raw materials. Once again, the loss of economic leadership and the crippled economy at home led the nation towards Hitlerism during the inter-war period.

Such an economic content in the emergence of modern Italy was not prominent because the southern part of Italy was primarily agricultural while the industries were located primarily in the northern region. Moreover, Italian industrialisation never reached the same stage as that of Germany to act as the propeller for its foreign policies.

In brief, both German and Italian nationalisms contain the three characteristic features of romanticism leading to faith, aggressive spirit leading to militarism, and the logic of economic development leading to imperialistic ambitions. Italy happened to be only a pale version of German nationalism because of certain inherent reasons like diplomacy playing a greater role in its unification and the country itself never being united by the nexus of capitalism and industrialisation, both unlike Germany.

FRANKFURT ASSEMBLY AND 1848

The history of Europe from 1815 to 1848 was an extraordinary period of turbulence. The series of revolts that broke out in the whole of Europe, excluding Czarist Russia and Britain, mostly ended in failure except in the States of Greece, Belgium and Switzerland. This discomfiture of the revolts can be basically attributed to the misalliance between social realities and the hopes and the ideals of some leaders and people. Germany, too, witnessed convulsions in 1848 and finally it ended on a note of total dismay and disgrace in 1850.

The events in France in 1848 stirred revolutionary hopes all through Europe. Three days after the abdication of Louis Philippe in France, there were big popular demonstrations in the Rhine land, followed by disturbances all over Germany. In the smaller German states, Liberals came to the fore like Baden, Wurttemberg, Saxony and Bavaria. Liberal Ministers were included in the governments and the press was granted more freedom.

The very particularism of the German states made it impossible for Prussia and Austria to check so many scattered revolts. The hesitations of the Prussian government produced riots in Berlin in March 1848. The king failing to cow down groups of workmen and students and later barricades and street-fighting, displayed a change of heart. He called out the troops, appointed a Liberal Ministry, convoked a Constituent Assembly and donning a scarf with revolutionary colours of black, red and gold, paraded in the street of his capital. Carried away by the popular acclaim he wrote to the indignant Czar Nicholas of Russia about the glorious German Revolution. The Constituent Assembly which met

Soon King William IV was made to take one more decision. In April 1848 responding to the popular demands and to instructions from the new governments of the several states, the Diet of the German Confederation at Frankfurt authorised popular election of a German National Assembly to devise a new federal government for the whole of Germany. Elections were duly held and Liberals obtained a large majority.

With the completion of the elections, the Diet of the previous German Confederation ceased to function. The new Frankfurt Assembly (Vorparliament or preliminary parliament) consisted of representatives elected by manhood suffrage of all the states of German Confederation, including Austria. The members of the Assembly were mostly university professors and businessmen, lawyers and judges, civil servants and clergy. Some 600 of the 831 members were lawyers or professors or their like, who earlier had had political responsibility. In outlook they were mild, legalistic and immensely earnest while opposing violence and social revolution. They wanted Germany to be federal, liberal, constitutional and united. Its principal task was to draft constitution for united Germany.

The social realities of the whole of Germany being what they were, the goals set by the Assembly could not be realized. The very task that the Assembly had to face was stupendous. Frankfurt Parliament had to establish the very laws and conditions of its being; reverse the historical process of centuries; overcome the particularism of 39 states while finding compensation for their princes; submerge the highly developed identity of Prussia; and incorporate Austria either with or without its non-Germanic provinces. (Hungary had

.../.

just re-asserted her independence, the Czechs had called a Pan-Slav Congress in opposition to the Pan-Germanism of Frankfurt and ^{the} Italian provinces looked southward).

Second, one immediate difficulty of the Assembly was it had no executive authority or executive powers. It was merely the voice of the embryonic German nation as echoed by its intellectual and professional classes. The delegates discussed matters at great length but as there was no one to whom they could give orders, nothing could be done in so far as the separate state governments chose to act ^{on} their own.

Third, the delegates to the Frankfurt Assembly were soon divided on a number of issues. The discussion on a National Church revealed serious religious differences. The Schleswig-Holstein question opened in its ranks. There was a Right and a Left to be reconciled, urgent economic problems to be tackled, and social revolution to be defeated. The Assembly wasted much of its time in debates like who should have the right to vote, whether Germany should retain the princes or become a republic. However much it was handicapped, the Parliament compounded its difficulties by venturing on a theoretical formulation of the fundamental rights of the German people. This was to repeat exactly the blunder of the early Revolutionary Assembly in France. A flood of oratory was released, the only effects of which were to exhibit the sharp differences of principle between the various sections of the Assembly, to waste precious moments which should have been used to the full before reaction had time to set in, and to disgust even the Liberals, who lost all patience with the futilities of an Assembly that was frittering away an opportunity for which patriots had hoped and fought and died. While all

this was transpiring the anti-democratic forces led by Austria, were recovering.

Fourth, the very base on which the Assembly was raised was shaky. The cities spoke first and spoke loudly on behalf of Liberalism. A little after some time the countryside spoke, less noisily but with greater weight, as the countryside was more devoted to traditional usages than to abstract liberty. The large majority of the population of Germany lived in rural communities, worked in the fields, distrusted townsfolk, and showed deference to landlord pastor and government official. Most landlords and clergymen were hostile to revolutionary changes. The staff of government officials which had been growing in numbers and in efficiency as well as the regular army officers, were not used to unstable parliamentary ministry. Added to this difficulty, the urban population did not give united and continuous support to the revolution. In the final analysis patriotism, which was emphasised by Liberals, was a sentiment which could be and was utilized by Conservatives to wean the masses, urban as well as rural, from revolution. It was no surprise that most of the pillars of Conservative society in government (recently over) were soon propped back into their customary places.

Fifth, by the time the Assembly debated the fundamental rights, one year was already over and reaction had fully set in throughout Germany. Even by the summer of 1848 the Conservative Germans were regaining confidence and their ability to do what others were doing in Austria. These developments made Frederick William IV

defy the Liberals who were then in control of the Prussian government since March. One was to terminate the war with Denmark, which, earlier, he was forced to

wage because of the request of the Frankfurt Assembly. The other was the pressure from the Conservatives within Prussia. The king, in the autumn of 1848, re-established an ultra-Conservative ministry and withdrew the forces fighting Denmark to overawe the Assembly and the populace in Berlin. Seeing that no serious trouble arose, the king dissolved the Assembly and drafted a constitution of his own.

Sixth, among the major forces of counter-revolution must be included fate itself. The cholera of 1848 caused hundreds of deaths. It struck particularly the towns, the centres of revolution. It left a heavy death toll and great social dislocation. The physical and psychological condition of survivors made prolonged effort of any kind impossible -- least of all the building of barricades and the raising of revolt.

Seventh, the fundamental cause of the failure of the parliamentarians including those of ^{the} Frankfurt Assembly lay in the fact that the revolutions, inspired by the unanimous determination of the people of German States to obtain liberty and nationhood, took place at a time when the economic and social structure, still strongly marked by the form of the Ancien Regime, did not allow the disinherited classes to make common cause against the classes in possession and to take up the banner of social revolution.*

Finally, the Liberal majority in the Frankfurt Assembly was embarrassed by these developments. In a desperate hope that the King's romantic attachment to nationalism might neutralise his aversion to Liberalism, they provided in the constitution, adopted in the summer of 1849, that the head of united Germany should be a

hereditary emperor and that he should be none other than the king of Prussia. Frederick William IV hesitated but he had no sympathy for the Liberal constitution which came with the imperial crown -- it came from the gutter, he said. He was also aware that assumption of imperial title would evoke jealous opposition from the kings of Bavaria, Wurttemberg, Sazony, Hanover and especially from the Hapsburg, emperor of Austria. He also received grave expostulations from Czar Nicholas of Russia. In the end, the King ended the period of uncertainty by repudiating the Frankfurt Constitution alongwith the Imperial Crown. The last hope of the nationalists faded. The Frankfurt Assembly came to an end in ignominy; once proclaimed as the Goddess of Liberty, it was left to die like a street woman in the gutter; and with it a liberal solution of the German question was discredited; a German parliamentary monarchy passed out of practical politics; and the empire, when it came, rested on the military might of Prussia.

Totally desperate but in mad protest, the extremist groups tried in May 1849 to dethrone princes and set up republics in various parts of Germany. These were speedily and sternly suppressed by Prussian troops. Surviving German republicans and German extremists were jailed or exiled; many found refuge across the Atlantic in United States.

Frederick William IV, although, now, a bitter foe of Liberalism, still dreamt of creating German union under Prussian leadership. After quiet had descended he invited the other German states, except Austria, to form a new and close union under his presidency with a Parliament representing the nation. Seventeen of the smaller states accepted the invitation and the new Parliament met at Erfurt in 1850. By then, Conservatism in

.../.

Austria had triumphed and Austria re-asserted forcefully her hegemony in Germany. It demanded that the German Confederation as it existed prior to 1848 should be restored forthwith. Frederick William IV realising that the South German states would join Austria and fearing that Russia might also do like that, gave way to the Austrian demands. Thus was signed the humiliating treaty of Olmutz in November 1850.

*"What changed European liberalism from the romantic, idealistic, democratic movement of 1848 into the realistic, unscrupulous, opportunist movement of these two decades was more than simple disillusionment after the revolutionary failures of 1848-9. It was the growth, in central Europe, of enterprising businessmen; it was the demonstration given to these men, in the financial crises of 1857 and 1866, that industrialism brought economic loss and insecurity of a kind which only bigger, stronger states could help to overcome; it was the living example of the rapid material progress made by Britain and France and Belgium, countries that enjoyed a degree of political unity hitherto unknown in central Europe. The renewed desire of liberals for substantial national solidarity was not unconnected with the anxiety of bankers and businessmen to enjoy the same political advantages and

contd.....next page/-

rights as their rivals in Western Europe. This new alignment was of far-reaching importance. The chief opposition to the national unification of Germany, as of Italy, came from people who favoured more authoritarian or absolutist government, conservatism, clericalism, traditionalism, and aristocracy.

If cautious constitutionalists like Cavour and authoritarian conservatives like Bismarck welcomed this alliance of liberal movements, it was likewise because, in the preceding age of revolution, liberals had shown themselves resolute opponents of radical revolts and popular risings; because they needed the active support of the new business classes in order to overcome the forces of reactionary separatism; because eventual domination of the new kingdoms by states such as Piedmont and Prussia would be sufficient guarantee against any revolutionary excesses. They had learned from Napoleon III the lesson of how readily republican and democratic enthusiasm could be diverted into support for an authoritarian and militaristic regime by skilful timing of demagogic gestures and popular plesbiscite; and until 1870 there was no comparable evidence of how disastrously, in later nineteenth-century conditions, such adventures could end.

X UNIFICATION OF ITALY X

The unification of Italy in the 19th century is a classic example of the wedlock between liberalism and nationalism. Motivating this alliance was the romantic spirit of the age. A close ally of romanticism was force. Italian nation that emerged in 1871 bears the imprint of these four features constituting its nature.

With the rending of the curtain in 1815, signalling the end of the Napoleon era, a new age began in the history of Italy. Befitting the expression of the age, Italy, in appearance, was a geographic expression as it consisted of 8 States. Austria controlled the two richest provinces of Lombardy and Venetia, rulers connected with Hapsburg empire of Austria sat on the throne of the Parma, Modena and Tuscany, the Papal States, the Kingdom of Naples and Sicily, the independent duchy of Lucca, and the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia.

Nevertheless, Italy of 1815 was not what it was before. Murat, while ruling Naples, proclaimed the union of Italy in 1815. He was soon defeated and shot, but this dramatic appeal was not forgotten by Italian patriots. The idea of united Italy was born. Along with this, the ideas of liberty, equality and fraternity as pollinated by Napoleon's armies left their own impact. These new hopes of Italy received momentum by the series of revolts that convulsed Europe from 1815 to 1848.

In the wake of Napoleonic era secret societies began to appear all over Italy. Here, too beneath the surface, liberalism seethed. The mass of peasantry were generally indifferent, but among the educated middle classes, the professional and business men, a demand for constitutional government and national independence grew gradually louder. As in so many other countries, the Italian liberals employed underground means of agitation, and

such secret societies as the Carbonari and Freemasons conducted a good deal of revolutionary propaganda. The Carbonari in Naples and Sicily alone numbered thousands. All the elements of disaffection gathered around this nucleus. Its determined purpose was to expel the foreigners to achieve constitutional freedom. Against the national and liberal aspirations of these Italians, Metternich used Austrian police and soldiers. The history of his Italian domination is in fact but an alternation of popular riots and military repression. Encouraged by revolution in Spain, the Carbonari incited a revolt in Naples in 1820 and forced its king to grant a constitution. Austria, being the custodian of the constitution of Italy suppressed the revolt. Even before order ^{was} restored in Naples, Piedmont was in rebellion and Carbonari started to stir. Again Austria intervened and this movement, too, collapsed.

But the discontent of the people was fanned into a flame by the news of the French Revolution in 1830. Trouble broke out first in Papal States and from it spread to the duchies of Parma and Modena. Austria again intervened and extinguished the flames of insurrection and many revolutionaries were hanged.

Once again in the 40s there was a great ferment of thought throughout Italy because of Young Italy Movement launched by Mazzini which became the nucleus of nationalist revolution supplanting Carbonari. The hopes of the people were roused in 1846. Pius IX, a reforming Pope, was elected to the Papacy. Metternich declared that a liberal Pope was a national impossibility. To coerce the Pope, Austrian troops occupied Ferrara. This event evoked strong protests by Pope and caused a wave of indignation all over Italy. Democratic excitement along with anti-Austrian sentiment spread all over the country in 1847. Next year was the year of revolution in Europe and it also broke out in Italy. A revolt began in the Two

.../-

Sicilies even before the February Revolution at Paris. The king of Sicily was forced to accept a liberal constitution. Following its example, King Charles Albert of Sardinia - Piedmont granted a liberal constitution with ministerial responsibility and guarantee of individual liberties. In the mean time popular revolts broke out. Within Austria, with the collapse of Metternich's power at Vienna, the tide of liberal national revolution rolled over Italy. At Milan the populace drove away the Austrian troops headed by Austrian General Radetzky. The people cheered the transfer of Lombardy from Austria to the kingdom of Sardinia. Austrian officials were driven out from Venice and an independent Venetian republic was proclaimed. Impelled by the fast growing situation, King Charles Albert declared war on Austria to drive out the Austrian troops from the four strongly fortified towns (called Quadrilateral) in northern Italy. His troops were joined by detachments from the Two Sicilies, the Papal States, Tuscany and Lombardy.

Soon events went against Italian patriots and liberals. The forces of Charles Albert were weakened by the withdrawal of the troops of the Pope and the King of the Two Sicilies. Both these rulers were alarmed by the excesses of the revolutionaries. The king of the Two Sicilies abrogated the constitution that was granted by him earlier. In July 1848 the Austrian General Radetzky decisively defeated the army of Charles Albert at Custoza. An armistice was agreed to and Austria reoccupied Lombardy.

This setback to Italian liberty and unity incited the Italian extremists. At Rome a liberal minister was assassinated and Pope Pius IX fled. In February 1849 a republic was proclaimed under the leadership of Mazzini. The temporal dominions of the Papacy was declared abolished. Radical republicans got an upper hand at Florence and at Naples and transformed Tuscany and the Two Sicilies into dictatorial republics. Trouble began

to brew in the kingdom of Sardinia also. The fate of Italy hung on the decision of Piedmont and its king. Yielding to the pressure of popular demand, Charles Albert made one more bid for Italian independence. He denounced the earlier armistice with Austria and crossed the frontier, but he was totally defeated at Novara. He abdicated and joined a Portugese monastery rather than sign the humiliating convention. Two days later, his son Victor Emmanuell II, came to terms with the Austrian General Radetzky.

By the end of 1849, throughout Italy and Austria absolutism triumphed except in Rome where France stole the honours of restoration and in Piedmont where Victor Emmanuell remained loyal to the constitution of his father.

King Victor Emmanuell II was a brave soldier, a sincere patriot and an honest king. It was luck that gave him a great Minister in Cavour. The Minister's whole policy was dominated by an inflexible will to effect the emancipation of Italy from Austria. He was determined that Italian unity must be lifted out of obscure Austrian domestic politics: it must become a European question on which the powers should fight.

Thus when the Crimean War broke out, Cavour made one of his boldest moves in the history of diplomacy. He joined the Anglo-French Alliance not as a subsidiary but as an equal - proudly refusing a subsidy that England offered. In the face of considerable opposition he had secured for Italy a seat at the Peace Conference of Paris in 1856 along with England, Russia, France and Austria. Later events proved that Cavour was justified in commenting that he would create Italy out of the mud of Crimea.

Encouraged by success, Cavour waited for his opportunity. In 1858 a stray remark was made by a visitor

.../-

that the Emperor of France, Napoleon III, was about to spend a month at the health resort of Plombières. Without invitation, Cavour too decided to take a holiday in Switzerland from where he leisurely proceeded to Plombières. There the French Emperor and the Sardinian Minister planned between them a war with Austria leading to re-organised Italy and some compensation for France. Piedmont prepared for war. King Victor Emmanuell II made provocative statements. Cavour was in despair as Austria kept cool, but luckily in April 1859 the Austrian government presented an ultimatum to Sardinia demanding immediate demobilisation or war. Cavour had won the dice. As far the previous agreement, French troops entered Piedmont. Then the allies advanced into Lombardy and won the victories of Magenta and Solferino while the Austrians fell back on the strong fortresses in Venetia.

These successes inflamed Italian nationalism. Popular demand arose for the incorporation of the States of central Italy including the Papal States with the kingdom of Sardinia. Napoleon III could not stomach this new development. The French Catholics criticised that the nationalist movement in the Papal States was due to their own emperor's sacrilegious intervention in Italy. One French Bishop branded Napoleon as the "modern Judas Iscariot". Other considerations also worried the emperor. Prussia was mobilising while Austrian armies were being reinforced. Impelled by all these considerations, Napoleon III, without informing Cavour, concluded an armistice at Villafranca with Austria. :

According to this agreement Lombardy would be ceded to Sardinia but Venetia would remain Austrian, while the princes of central Italy would be reinstated. The Italian patriots and French rebels assailed Napoleon as a traitor. King Victor Emmanuell was obliged to accede to the truce but Cavour denounced this and

resigned his office. The terms of Villafranca were confirmed by the Treaty of Zurich.

But the Italian patriots would not accept defeat. Guided by radical republican leaders and with the connivance of the Sardinian government the inhabitants of duchies of Central Italy would not accept the reinstatement of their former rulers. They held plebiscites and voted to join the kingdom of Sardinia. Napoleon III refused to recognise such an exercise. Soon Cavour swallowing his pride, returned to his post and persuaded Napoleon to change his mind. By the Treaty of Turin in 1860 Sardinia gave to France both Savoy and Nice as if Napoleon had carried out the original bargain of freeing Italy from the Alps to the ^{Adriatic:} ~~the~~ and France in return recognised Sardinia's annexation not only of Lombardy but also of the duchies of Tuscany, Parma and Modena and of the Papal province of Romagna.

Knowing well that he would not be able to rely on Napoleon III, Cavour turned from princes and foreign alliance to Mazzini and Garibaldi and the rebellious instinct of the people. With utmost diplomatic caution and ingenuity he ventured on one of the most amazing enterprises in the history of European diplomacy.

In the second half of 1859 the conspirators in Sicily appealed to Garibaldi for help. He accepted the invitation on the condition that the revolt should be in the name of Italy and Victor Emmanuell. Also to begin with, it should be started by the Sicilians themselves. In April 1860 a revolution broke out. It was crushed by the King of Naples. Even then, Garibaldi rushed forward. Cavour was in dilemma. He could not extend an open official encouragement, nor could he shy away from popular demand. To resolve the problem Cavour pursued his double game. While disclaiming to the ambassadors of the Powers any knowledge of the affair, he permitted the preparations

to go on. Victor Emmanuell stipulated that officers of the Sardinian army should not be allowed to enlist but the rebels were allowed to collect arms and the harbour authority of Genoa connived at the embarkation of the expedition of Garibaldi.

In May Garibaldi landed in Sicily. His troops disembarked under what was practically the protection of a small British naval squadron. He won a hard fight at Calatafimi. Garibaldi's brilliant success once again embarrassed Cavour. He was certain that the general would cross to the main land and then advance on the Papal State. Cavour failed to persuade Garibaldi to stop with the annexation of Sicily.

Finding himself helpless, Cavour decided to play his own game against Garibaldi. Napoleon III proposed that an Anglo-French squadron should keep Garibaldi confined to Sicily, but Britain rejected the proposal on the principle of non-intervention. Garibaldi crossed over to the mainland. The next day Garibaldi entered the capital ahead of his army. Having abandoned any pretence of a hostile force, Garibaldi proclaimed himself as dictator of the kingdom.

The revolutionary infection began to spread to the Papal State. Cavour determined to strike. He resolved to pre-empt Garibaldi by inviting the Papal State to defend Rome from Garibaldi. Also, Cavour sounded Napoleon III. "Do it quickly" was said to be the reply of the emperor who was in the habit of detaching himself from his own foreign office. Cavour asked nothing more. Finding an excuse, Sardinia ordered the invasion of Papal State in September. The Pope's army was defeated and Umbria and the Marches were occupied by Piedmont. It was a race between Garibaldi and the royal troops. Unexpectedly, Garibaldi was delayed by the resistance of Capua and Gaeta.

Immediately after the occupation of the Papal State plebiscite was held in Sicily and Naples. They expressed an overwhelming desire for merger with Sardinia. King Victor Emmanuell II crossed the frontier at the head of his army. Outwitted by the diplomacy of Cavour but loyal to the king, Garibaldi surrendered his power and his army to Victor Emmanuell. At the palace of Naples Victor Emmanuell was invested with the kingship of Sicily and Naples while Garibaldi resigned his dictatorship and called upon the people to lay aside all differences. Three months later Cavour died.

Thus it would be seen that within two years from 1859-1861, i.e. after the humiliating armistice of Villafranca, all the Italians were politically united under the Sardinia's patriot king and a liberal constitution. Sardinia's five million population swelled into 22 million of the new Italian State. Sardinian Parliament became the Italian Parliament. In March 1861 Victor Emmanuell II assumed the title of the king of Italy while dropping the title of the king of Sardinia.

The epilogue for the unification of Italy was played during the Franco-Prussian war. Indeed in 1867 Garibaldi made an unsuccessful attempt to capture Rome but he was defeated by Franco-Papal forces at Metana. Despite this set back, the Franco-Prussian war gave the right opportunity for Italians to round out and strengthen their national State. On the eve of Sedan Napoleon III, finding himself in a desperate situation, withdrew the French garrison from Rome. Pope Pious IX was left with his temporal rule trusting his personal guards and a small force of foreign volunteers.

After the battle of Sedan, it became clear that Napoleon could no more intervene in Rome. Then the government of king Victor Emmanuell II ordered an Italian army to invade and occupy the Papal State.

.../-

Pope protested and made a show of strength. The troops of Victor Emmanuell entered Rome. A plebiscite was held which overwhelmingly went in favour of union. In July 1871 king Victor Emmanuell made solemn entry into the new capital. The seat of the temporal power of the Papacy (Rome) for more than 12 centuries, became the capital of new Italy.

When the Risorgimento reached its culmination in November 1871 with the opening of the new Italian Parliament in Rome it was a full half century old. It had attracted heroic self-sacrifice and boundless enthusiasm. It had triumphed partly because of amazing pertinacity and dauntless courage. But it had also triumphed because of war and deceit, by a policy modelled on Machiavelli's combination force and fraud. Its triumph was bitter-sweet, and its nemesis fifty years later was to be the inflated bombast of Mussolini's fascism.

Joseph Mazzini, Count Cavour and Garibaldi were the three personalities who contributed the most to the unification of Italy. The first was its ideologue; the second, the constructive statesman; and the third, the romantic hero.

From the very beginning Mazzini was enthused with romantic fervour for revolutionary movements. Born in Geneva, he was brought up in the nationalist and democratic movement of Italy. When he was 10 years old Geneva came under the rule of Piedmont in 1815. The city of Geneva resented this loss of its republican liberties. When the Carbonari risings of 1820-21 were crushed, the city became the refuge ^{of} / the defeated Piedmontese liberals. Their sorry plight left a deep impression on Mazzini. As a student he read most of the works of the romantic writers in Europe. His life clearly indicates the close relationship between romanticism and revolution.

Now onwards devotion to literature competed with service to politics all through the life of Mazzini. In his journalistic writings he turned out to be a liberal agitator. Just for the sake of enthusiasm he joined the Carbonari.* In 1830 Mazzini was imprisoned for his Carbonarist activities. Based on his experience as a

* Beneath mystic rites and symbolic language drawn partly from Christianity, partly from the processes of charcoal-burning, it concealed and fostered a determined political purpose, the expulsion of the foreigner and the achievement of constitutional freedom. All classes joined it - nobles, military officers, peasants, priests, but especially the bourgeoisie and the gentry, among whom liberal and patriotic ideas had taken deepest root. It spread beyond Italy, and within the peninsula the black, red, and blue of the Carbonari became the flag of revolution, until it was superseded in 1831 by the green, white, and red tricolour.

member of the secret organisation, he formulated the idea of a new movement of his own.

It was in 1831 that Mazzini projected his non-secret organization called 'Young Italy' which consisted of intellectuals under 40 years of age. Its object was the propagation of republican and nationalist ideas, its methods were education and insurrection. Revolution to be successful, must be preceded by renaissance. This society soon became the nucleus of nationalist revolution superseding the Carbonari.

From Piedmont there spread all over Italy societies of young men, bound by oath, dedicated to the achievement of a national republic, fed by the eloquence of their exiled founder - for most of Mazzini's life was spent in exile in France or England - fortified by appeals to the martyrs of the holy Italian cause, to "the memory of our greatness and the sense of our degradation," to "the blush which rises to the brow of an Italian when he stands before the citizens of other lands, knowing he has no citizenship, no country, no national flag." God, the People, and Italy were the cries of the society; education, literary propaganda, and, if necessary, insurrection its methods; the conversion of an idea into a popular cause its achievement.

For Mazzini liberalism and nationalism were reconcilable, the one supporting the other; both the individual and the national were to him sacred. He called for a religious spirit working together with democratic principles as the best means of achieving human progress. Religion enabled a society where the individual would enjoy two freedoms; personal and the freedom of national association. All peoples who wished for nationality, so Mazzini taught, had a sacred right to have their wishes

...../-

fulfilled for it was God's purpose. He thought that when the peoples ^{were} permitted and their will unfettered they would live in harmony. Nation would not fight nation. Each would make its distinctive contribution to the broad progress of humanity. Thus Mazzini not only believed in the divine destiny of the Italian nation but also preached the national causes of the Slavs, the Hungarians, the Poles, and indeed of every group that expressed a desire for national identification. Like Hegel he saw a divine purpose. God had divided mankind into distinct groups, nations each different, but each with equal rights. The nation expressed the will of the individual. Thus democracy and nationalism were harmonized. Mazzini's ideals belong not only to Italy but to Europe and beyond. Whilst having faith in the ultimate unity of humanity Mazzini correctly recognized that nationalism was the great motivating force of nineteenth-century history.

Inspired by his own ideas Mazzini gathered round him a multitude of ardent spirits like Garibaldi who were inflamed with patriotic fervour. The movement was a success. By 1834 it had 60,000 members. These young Italians did much to train the Italian people in the ideas of liberty and unity. This movement gave a fillip to the Risorgimento, the conviction of a group of play-writes, poets and novelists who contributed to the Italian literary revival and the spread of patriotic fervour among literate Italians. Also, it should be borne in mind that it was the effect of the Young Italy that provided the motive power for the revolution of 1848 in Italy.

Regarding practical matters, Mazzini was clear in his mind that Austria must be expelled from the ^{peninsula} without which Italy would never unite. This must be done by Italians alone without foreign aid. It could be definitely done if Italians would only combine and rise

to do it. Self-reliance was his motto. He further propounded that the expulsion of foreigners would be followed by the collapse of the petty governments which were kept alive by the Austrian support. And thus the way would be cleared for the establishment of the Italian republic.

Historically, Mazzini was condemned to death in absentia in Piedmont for his role in the unsuccessful attempt in 1833 to incite the Piedmontese armies and navy to insurrection.

For the second time Mazzini figured as an important member of the ill-fated Republic of Rome in 1849. The defeat of Piedmont at Custoza and Novara forced Charles Albert to agree for an armistice and the reoccupation of Lombardy by Austria. This setback to Italian unity and liberty incited Italian extremists to undertake risky ventures. The radical republicans got an upper hand at Florence ^{and} Naples and also in Tuscany and in Two Sicilies. Pope Pious IX fled. It was then that a republic was proclaimed under the leadership of Mazzini. The temporal dominion of the Papacy was declared abolished. The republic of Rome and Tuscany decided to unite in the election of a constituent assembly which should try a form of government for all Italy. But soon the tide turned against the republicans. Four foreign armies of France, Austria, Spain and Naples advanced on Rome. Garibaldi won one engagement but later he was defeated and fled to Tuscany. Soon Venico, the last foothold of republicanism fell to French troops. The failure of republican solution to Italy revived faith in constitutional monarchy as the only acceptable solution. The dreams of fraternal rose-water revolutions cherished by Mazzini were rudely shattered. And Mazzini fled to London with a greyish beard, altogether a new feature.

As a practical leader of insurrection Mazzini proved a failure.* However, through the education of revolutionary literature he was successful in giving Italy a nationalist direction. His ideas proved a live force from 1830 onwards. Garibaldi's expedition of his Thousand proved what could be achieved by popular appeal and by an uprising in Sicily originally inspired by the followers of Mazzini.

For the last time Mazzini was again found in Italy when Garibaldi proposed to cross the mainland and advance towards Rome. Under the guidance of Mazzini voluntary expeditions were organised with the deliberate intention of invading the Papal dominion. This effort too ended in failure as Cavour along with Victor Emmanuel II first reached Rome and then checkmated the advance of Garibaldi.

* "If royal Sardinia had failed against Austria, Mazzini had failed even more egregiously with his Roman republic of 1849. He had demonstrated that the Italian masses were not really with him; that they were too steeped in monarchical traditions to support his radical republicanism. By his "excesses" at Rome, moreover, he had alienated the order-loving middle class, disgusted the clergy, and helped to transform Pope Pius IX from a liberal patriot into a conservative protected by French troops. Republicans there were in Italy after 1849, but they were a dwindling party among intellectuals and workmen. Mazzini, living in exile, engaged ever more in vain plots and conspiracies."

GARIBALDI AND ITALIAN UNIFICATION

Garibaldi, born in 1807 at Nice, appeared and re-appeared in Italian history as the most strange and startling personality of 19th century. He had no aptitude for the formal education of the day. By nature he was freedom loving, romantic and poetical. He did not learn enough to train his mind to wide understanding and deep reflection. Ten years experience in the coastal trade brought him into contact with Italian patriots in exile, apart from being captured by pirates thrice, which inspired him with boundless zeal for Italian freedom which filled the rest of his life. He believed "in Italy as the Saints believed in God".

Garibaldi was introduced to Mazzini and it made him join Young Italy Society. In 1833 he was a party to one of Mazzini's many conspiracies in which his part was to entice the sailors of the Sardinian navy. The conspiracy failed and Garibaldi was forced to flee. For the first time his name came to the notice of Sardinian government which condemned him to death.

From 1836 to 1848 he lived in the New World. He led a wild and roving life in South America, leading local wars, participating in adventures of pure roman, and finally marrying off a wife whose companionship is a subject for saga. These adventures of Garibaldi in South America also gave him experience of guerrilla warfare which was of great use to him in 1860 in Italy.

Returning to Italy, a romantic figure in a red shirt, Garibaldi led a volunteer army of 3,000 personal followers in the Sardinian war of 1848 against Austria. After the defeat of Custoza, Garibaldi was summoned by Mazzini to defend the Roman republic against the French troops. A heroic defence was followed by a heroic retreat.

...../-

Most of his followers were shot dead. While his wife died, Garibaldi first escaped to Tuscany and from there onwards to America.

In New York he first worked as a candle-maker and then as a trading skipper. He managed to amass a small fortune . In 1854 he returned once more to Italy, awaiting an opportunity to strike for national liberty. He partly used the money for buying the small island of Caprera near Sardinia and for building a house there. He gazed over the surface of the sea awaiting the call.

In 1856 Garibaldi met Cavour and he was converted to the cause of the Sardinian monarchy. True, Garibaldi remained republican at heart but he loyally, but under great stress served Victor Emmanuel to the end. This understanding between Garibaldi and the king proved to be of great use particularly when the relations between him and Cavour came to a breaking point.

More important was the fact that because of Garibaldi's decision to support monarchy many patriots accepted in 1859 an alliance with the French. Garibaldi commanded a Sardinian regiment with success but it was cut short by the armistice of Villafranca.

Nevertheless, in the autumn of 1859 the conspirators of Sicily appealed to Garibaldi for help. He accepted the invitation in the name of Italy and Victor Emmanuel. At that time Cavour too played his cards. In helping Garibaldi, Cavour thought that insurrections, too, might have their uses. In 1860, revolution broke out in Sicily. Now Garibaldi appealed to Cavour and the king for authorisation and help. Cavour was caught in a dilemma. Garibaldi's name was on everyone's lip. Outwardly Cavour pretended his ignorance to the ambassadors of the Powers of the whole affair but permitted Garibaldi to collect

his volunteers and weapons. The Admiral of the Sardinian navy was secretly instructed to guard Garibaldi's ships.

In May 1860, Garibaldi landed in Sicily while he was given protection by a small British naval squadron. He advanced on the capital Palermo with just his 1000 men, all wearing the famous red shirts, while the enemy's troops numbered 20,000. It was a hard won victory for Garibaldi. Soon Garibaldi entered Palermo and proclaimed himself dictator of Sicily. This brilliant success of Garibaldi presented a problem to Cavour. It was certain that Garibaldi would cross over to the mainland. With every victory he became more independent, more impatient and distrustful of Cavour and his cautious methods. Mazzini too was in Italy. Volunteer forces were being raised with the intention of invading the Papal dominion. It was important for Cavour that Garibaldi should serve the cause of the Italian kingdom, but he should not invite the wrath of other Powers by attacking Rome.

When Cavour failed to convince Garibaldi to stay back in Sicily, he undertook the necessary counter-measures. Cavour's agents intrigued in the kingdom of Naples in favour of the monarchical union. Even the Sardinian Admiral was asked to win over the enemy's fleet.

But no stopping of Garibaldi. He crossed over to the mainland. Napoleon III proposed to use navy to stop Garibaldi, but Britain rejected it on the principle of non-intervention. Garibaldi started advancing towards Naples. Garibaldi's progress became a simple triumphal march. The people received him as a second Christ. More surprising was that Garibaldi entered the capital by train all alone by going ahead of his army. His carriage passed through the centre of the city, while the soldiers with loaded cannon looked on. Garibaldi stood up, folded his arms and looked them straight in the face.

...../-

Some of them saluted and no one fired a shot. Naples was captured almost without firing a shot.

France was alarmed, apart from Piedmont. The revolutionary infection began to spread to the Papal State. Now Cavour decided to intervene. "Italy must be saved from foreigners, evil principles and madmen". Agents were despatched to sound Napoleon. The monarch made the expected remark, "do it quickly". Cavour asked him nothing more. After finding an excuse, he ordered the invasion of the Papal State. Umbria and the Marches were captured. Now it was a race between Garibaldi and the royal troops. By then, plebiscites were held in Sicily and Naples which favoured annexation by Sardinia. Unfortunately, Garibaldi was held up at the fortresses of Gaeta and Capua. The king, Victor Emmanuel, himself appeared with an army. In October Garibaldi outwitted by the diplomacy of Cavour but loyal to the king, surrendered his power and his army to Victor Emmanuel. On November 9 at an imposing ceremony in Naples Victor Emmanuel was proclaimed the king of Sicily and Naples.

The next day with a bag of seed-corn for his farm as his only spoil, Garibaldi returned to his island of Capri. In his island he found the richest consolation than in the world of politics and its entanglements. Many times in the coming 20 years he reappeared in national and international affairs - in the war with Austria in 1859 and a volunteer in the French service in 1870.

In brief, Garibaldi turned history into an epoch and politics into a romance. Till 1880 he spent his time

...../-

by calling his cows by name and saving his goats among the crags of Caprera. It should be noted in the end that it was he who cleft a way with his sword when Cavour's diplomacy was brought to a halt. But this is not to deny the fact that both Mazzini and Garibaldi would have been more martyrs of barren hopes without Cavour.

CAVOUR'S CONTRIBUTION TO
THE UNIFICATION OF ITALY*

From a mere geographical expression the vision of Italy as one unified State appeared from the days of the Great Napoleon. Murat, the representative of the Great Napoleon in Italy, was the first to think in terms of united Italy. Behind this hope lay the romantic wave that spread over Europe in the wake of the Great Napoleon's conquests of Europe. "The French revolutionaries spread liberalism by intention but created nationalism by inadvertance."

The greatest hurdle in the unification of Italy was the divided nature of the country and the near total dominance of Austria over the whole peninsula. When Europe was shaken by liberal and romantic revolts in 1820, 1830 and 1848, Italy, too, had experienced popular upheavals. Every time Austria put down the fires of revolt. The most humiliating defeat for the liberal constitutionalists occurred in 1848. King Charles Albert of Piedmont was defeated at Custoza and Novara. Disgusted, the king abdicated and joined a Portuguese monastery. He was succeeded by Victor Emmanuell. Despite the persistent opposition of Austria, the king retained the constitution which was sanctioned by his father, Charles Albert, in 1848. This event made him gain favour in the eyes of all patriots.

Now Cavour enters the stage. The king and the minister carried the unification of Italy almost till the final stages. Born in 1810, Cavour belonged to a noble Piedmont's family. In his teens he served in the Sardinian army and imbibed liberal ideas. His extensive reading of English authors and a subsequent sojourn in Britain, confirmed his views.

* You must gather all the points on Cavour in the topic 'Unification of Italy'.

Entering the cabinet in 1850, Cavour became Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1852. He remained in these posts with a brief interruption, until his death in 1861.

As already remarked, Cavour imbibed the English liberalism of the day: individualism, material progress, a constitutional king, and a parliament representing the educated classes to promote liberty in ecclesiastical and economic matters. As premier, Cavour strove to promote the material welfare of his State in accordance with the English liberal model. Tariffs were lowered. The building of factories and the importation of machinery were encouraged. Roads were improved and railways ~~con-~~ constructed. The public budget was reorganized, and the taxes, though increased, were more equitably distributed. At the same time, Cavour sought to lessen the influence of the Church in Sardinia and to restrict its privileges. He expelled the Jesuits from the country and suppressed many monastic establishments. His ideal, he said, was "a free Church in a free State," but in practice he subordinated the Church to the State.

Reforms within Sardinia were but a prelude to a far more ambitious plan of Cavour, that is, the political union of ^{the} entire Italian peninsula under Victor Emmanuell II. The greater the obstacles in achieving the goal, the more dogged became Cavour's determination. He cooperated with the king in re-organizing the Sardinian army and in improving its discipline. When the times called for, he held mysterious dialogues with Garibaldi. He patronized secret societies which aimed at binding together the scattered elements of societies, opposed to Austrian control, throughout Italy. Above all, he utilized his diplomatic talents to enlist foreign aid for Sardinia.

It was with this goal that Cavour began to woo the liberal sympathies of the western peoples through a vigorous and judicious literary propaganda. He turned the exiles at Turin into a brilliant army of scribes who wrote articles in the Morning Post, The Times, Le Motin and L'Indépendance Belge. The British government was friendly and it sent an ambassador to Turin. In France, in spite of the clerical party, the emperor was sympathetic to the Italian cause and he gave secret diplomatic encouragement.

In these attempts Cavour, like Bismarck, was an exponent of Real Politik, that is, government and state policy divorced from moral considerations while being dictated only by the exigencies of power and later to be judged by success or failure.

Cavour's first significant step in foreign policy was to cause diminutive Sardinia in 1855 to join France and Great Britain (and the Ottoman Empire) in the Crimean War against Russia. He expected Austria to side with Russia in this war, and in joining France and Britain he counted on their support against Austrian rule in Italy. The persistent neutrality of Austria rendered abortive this part of his scheme, but Cavour had the satisfaction of reaping other rewards which he had foreseen. Sardinia gained the sympathy of liberals all over western Europe, and Cavour was enabled to attend the peace congress at Paris (1856) and there denounce Austrian rule. Sardinia had no interest in the Eastern Question; Cavour's policy was one of simple adventure, pursued definitely and skilfully, that Sardinia might rank as a European state, that the Italian Question might be forced before the diplomatic attention of the powers, and that at least one of them should dispose herself to support it. It was a gamble upon the political conscience of Napoleon III, and upon the sense of England and France: a gamble

without reserve, guarantee, or condition, for all that Cavour carried away from the Peace Congress for his consolation was the memory of a sympathetic speech by Lord Clarendon, and an ominous remark from the French Emperor - "I have a presentiment that the actual peace will not be long.

After this small achievement, Cavour began to plan for the next stage in the unification of Italy. When he was informed that the French emperor was resting at Plombieres, Cavour, too, chose a holiday in Switzerland and proceeded to call on the emperor. Between them they planned a war with Austria with the promise of Savoy and Nice to France. For nine months Cavour was in terrible suspense. He sought pretext after pretext for provoking Austria so that war could be precipitated before Napoleon III changed his mind. Military preparations were begun. He provoked Austria by hostile tariffs, press attacks and fomenting insurrection in Lombardy and Venetia. Even Napoleon III declared that his relations with Austria were not as good as they were. These were all sufficient warnings for what was to come.

Alarmed by the past experience of France under Napoleon, England managed an European conference to prevent a war. Cavour was in total despair and he even contemplated committing suicide. Although the European conference agreed on a general disarmament of the three states involved, Austria foolishly triggered off the war. Totally provoked by Piedmont's behaviour, Austria sent an ultimatum demanding instant disarmament or war. To the European statesmen Austria appeared as the aggressor and Cavour won his point. In the short war that was fought, Austria was defeated and made to surrender Lombardy to Piedmont by the armistice of Villafranca. Austria was permitted to retain Venetia, which was to form part of an Italian federation under papal presidency.

Cavour urged the king not to accept the infamous treaty. As the king did not heed his counsel, Cavour retired into private life.

Before returning to serve the King, Cavour abandoned for ever the policy of working out the salvation of Italy through foreign alliance. Also, he began to seek the wisdom of making use of insurrection whenever circumstances called for. After the Villafrance armistice was confirmed by the treaty in Zurich, it was a signal for all liberal and republican groups of Italy to act on their own. The news of the vacation of Lombardy by Austria acted as a signal for the explosion of popular feelings in the central duchies. Parma, Modena and Tuscany rose in revolt and expelled their rulers. In the most northerly Papal State, Romagna, the people repudiated the sovereignty of the Pope. All these States unanimously voted for merger with Piedmont. Faced with such a situation, Napoleon III was caught between two contradictory ideas of maintaining the sanctity of the treaty of Zurich and his own professed sympathy for national movements. Also, coercion was an impossibility for Britain's policy was openly sympathetic to Italian aspirations. Austria, on the other hand, was naturally opposed to any annexations by the kingdom of Sardinia and/or the reduction of the Papal power.

Now it was Cavour who had found a way out. He re-opened the offer of Savoy and Nice (earlier promised to Napoleon III at Plombieres) and thereby secured the emperor's consent to the incorporation of the central duchies to Sardinia. The result was that in Tuscany, Parma, Modena and Romagna plebiscites were held and all of them voted for their union with Piedmont. This was the second great step towards Italian unity. Except for Venetia, the northern half of Italy was united and made free from foreign control. Cavour was criticised

by the nationalists for his surrender of Nice and Savoy. Britain was incensed by the role played by France. Garibaldi bitterly complained that Cavour had made him a foreigner in his own land as Nice was his birth-place.

Whatever may be the limited success of Cavour (return to the office in January 1860), he began to readjust his sights. From princes and foreign alliances, Cavour turned to Mazzini and Garibaldi and the insurrectionary instinct of the people. Very soon an opportunity arose. With the utmost diplomatic cooperation and ingenuity Cavour embarked upon one of the most important enterprises in the history of Italian Unification. While paying scant respect to the public law of Europe, Cavour continued to trust the political potentialities of risings in the name of Victor Emmanuell.

In April 1860 revolution broke out in Sicily. Garibaldi (earlier received an intimation of the forthcoming event from the rebels of Sicily) was eager to play his knight-errant's role. He appealed to Cavour and the king for authorisation and help. Cavour was caught in a dilemma but as he had already made up his mind by 1860, he cautiously dealt his cards.

While pretending ignorance to the whole affair to the other Powers, he allowed Garibaldi and others to gather arms and turned a blind eye to the harbour authorities of Genova who connived at the embarkation of Garibaldi's expedition to Sicily. He even asked his Sardinian Admiral to protect Garibaldi's ships if the need arose.

After winning victory in Sicily, Garibaldi grew intoxicated with success. He started making preparations for invading the mainland and ultimately attacking Papal Rome. Once more embarrassing problem confronted Cavour. Cavour thought that with every victory Garibaldi

was growing more and more sympathetic to the extreme Republicans among his followers while forgetting his earlier promise to Piedmont. Cavour was determined that every success of Garibaldi should be won for the Italian kingdom. He was also anxious that France and Austria should not be provoked by any ill-timed attack on Rome.

Failing to persuade Garibaldi, Cavour decided to pay him back in his own coin. He opened secret negotiations with the Neapolitan kingdom against whom Garibaldi was fighting. The Sardinian Admiral was even sent to win over the Neapolitan fleet. Finally he turned once again to his old ally, Napoleon III, who, for different reasons, shared Cavour's fears. Napoleon was suggested that he should accede to Piedmont's occupation of Umbria and the Marches. The emperor cryptically replied, "Do it quickly".

Resolving to anticipate Garibaldi, the Papal States were invaded by the royal troops of Piedmont. It was a race between Garibaldi and the royal troops. Piedmont's troops occupied the Papal states, which were already prepared by the work of Cavour's agents to receive it. Then the army destroyed the Papal forces. From there it marched on to Naples to check the advance of Garibaldi. After plebiscites were held in Umbria and the Marches in October, they were merged with Piedmont's monarchy. In the same month Victor Emmanuell and Cavour rode into Naples and annexed it after a popular plebiscite. What can we say about the volte face of Cavour? He can be best defended in his own words: "Italy must be saved from foreigners, evil principles and mad men".

Garibaldi, true to his simplicity and selflessness, gracefully surrendered his victories to king Victor Emmanuell and enjoined his failure to end all differences.

In February 1861, the first Parliament was held at Turin and in March, less than two years after Villafranca, Victor Emmanuell II was proclaimed king of Italy (save for Venice and Rome), for the first time since the fall of the Roman Empire.

Until his death in 1861, Cavour was undoubtedly the most important man in Italian politics. It was he who brought to fruition the work begun by Mazzini and Garibaldi and this with his wisdom and foresight, which none of them possessed. Mazzini, its fervent though unpractical apostle, and Garibaldi, its soldier and knight-errant, might have been martyrs of a barren hope without Cavour, the real creator of Italian unity. "His was the master-brain which mobilised the inspiration of Mazzini into diplomatic force, and beat the word of Garibaldi into a national weapon". But for his sound judgment and successful diplomacy, the idealism of Mazzini and the ill-guided enthusiasm of Garibaldi would have added another chapter to the history of blasted hopes and fruitless struggles.

✧ UNIFICATION OF GERMANY ✧

The aftermath of Napoleonic era was an important phase in the history of Europe. The French Revolution and the Napoleonic era had sown seeds of modernity far and wide. Germany, too, was a beneficiary of these seeds of modernity.

The achievement of German unification was contributed by forces, factors and personalities. In the forces the most important was the cultural renaissance of Germany, which witnessed eminent musicians, men of letters and philosophers. It was the age of Beethoven, Goethe, Schiller, Kant and Hegel. This intellectual lead made Germany outpace France which held such leadership in the 18th century. It was the men of letters, the poets, and the professors who made Pan-Germanism articulate, who preserved Germany from the provincialism which threatened to engulf her.

The philosophers, Herder and Fichte, taught Germans to cherish and respect Volkgeist or the peculiar national character as the fountain of all good culture and civilization. Both Hegel and Fichte glorified the State. The chief intellectual support for the regeneration of Prussia and the growth of nationalism in Germany came from the universities, and in particular, the University of Berlin. The students formed secret societies and they made noisy demonstrations that caused uneasiness both in Berlin and Vienna. Hegel was the principal exponent of philosophy in Berlin. His new philosophy of authority and State power captivated the intellectuals of the day in Europe including those of Germany.

Behind this activity lay the spirit of liberation evoked by the revolutionary and Napoleonic storms. This change in the thinking of Germans influenced politicians

and statesmen. After the defeat of Prussia at the battle of Jena, by Napoleon in 1806, Prussia went ahead with drastic reorganization of her army under the guidance of Scharnhorst. The machinery of government was overhauled by Stein and Hardenberg. The latter wrote to the Prussian King, "we must do from above what the ~~Prussians~~ French have done from below." Prussian victory at Leipzig in 1813 further aroused German nationalism at the popular level. It was interpreted as the fruit and justification of all what the nationalists had been preaching and reformers doing to regenerate Prussia. It became a patriotic legend although in fact it was an allied victory.

The second important influence in the unification of Germany was the economic factor. King Frederick William III's only memorable novelty was the party played by him in effecting a tariff union (Zollverein) of most of the German states. He had ended the tariff barriers between the provinces of Prussia in 1818. By 1833 agreements were reached by him with other German rulers for the abolition of tariffs between the several States.

This tariff union went along with the development of economy as caused by railways, industries and banking. The dramatic triumph of the new Prussian war machine in 1864 against Denmark, in 1866 against Austria-Hungary, and in 1870 against France, brought home to the whole of Europe how much the very nature of warfare, too, was being transformed by science. Not only did railways make the transport of troops and munitions faster and easier, but long-range field artillery capable of greater range, accuracy, and rate of fire was one of the decisive factors in Prussian victories. The French command in 1870 was defeated largely because it completely miscalculated how long a small body of men, armed with

...../-

the telegraph could summon reinforcements brought speedily to the scene by train.

Otherwise, the rule of Frederick William III was reactionary. The loose German federation consisting of 30 states along with Prussia were given a Diet composed of delegates of the reigning sovereigns but presided over by Austria. The member States were free to enter into alliances with foreign powers. The confederation was placed nominally under the guarantee of all the European powers. In actual practice it was Austria under Metternich that manipulated the affairs. Metternich could always count on the support of the princes of smaller States who were instinctively jealous of Prussia. Although the confederation promised a representative form of government for the federative States, Metternich effectively blocked attempts to realise this goal. In almost all the States restrictions were imposed on the press and the Parliament while the police was arbitrary. Frederick William III wanted to grant a charter to his people but he was so timid that he considered it an honour to defer to the superior judgement of Metternich and the Austrian Emperor. Prussian policy was made in Vienna, wrote Bismarck and there was hardly a diplomatic issue between 1815 and 1850 that was not decided by Austria.

All the time the national and liberal sentiment was smouldering. By 1847 things began to change. Liberal aspirations were voiced openly and widely throughout Central Europe. In Prussia, King Frederick William IV, who succeeded his father in 1840, was consolidating the various local provincial Diets into a united one for the whole of the kingdom. But there were a number of States with liberal forms of government like Baden, Württemberg Saxony and Bavaria where liberal ministers began to be included in the governments and the press was granted

more freedom. For both Prussia and Austria it became impossible to check so many scattered revolts. Riots broke out in Berlin. This forced the king to make enough concessions to stem the revolt. He declared himself in favour of a federal German Reich to replace the existing federation, with an elected Parliament, freedom of the press, one national citizenship and a national army. Street riots broke out and barricades were set up in Berlin. This forced the king to form a Liberal Government.

That was how a new assembly was elected to by-pass the existing governments of the States. It met at Frankfurt in May 1848. It set for a whole year but it proved a failure. Soon the tide turned against the Liberals and Nationalists. In the autumn of 1848, Frederick William IV acted. The Liberal Ministry was replaced by an ultra-Conservative one. The Conservative triumph in both Prussia and Austria left the Liberal majority in German National Assembly at Frankfurt in a ridiculous situation. The Frankfurt Assembly finally offered the Crown to the Prussian King. The Czar of Russia sent ominous notes to the king. In 1849 the kind ended the period of uncertainty by repudiating the Frankfurt Constitution and refusing the imperial Crown.

Although Frederick William IV, now a bitter foe of Liberalism, he was still haunted by the dream of creating a German Union under Prussian leadership. After suppressing the republican rioting, he invited the other German States, except Austria, to form a new and close union under his presidency, with a Council representing the Princes and a Parliament representing the nation. Seventeen princes accepted the invitation. The parliament of the proposed German Union met at Erfurt in March 1850. By then Austria was in a position to follow up the triumph of conservatism at home. It demanded the

...../-

abandonment of the German Union project and the restoration of the German Federation as it was from 1815 to 1848. Frederick William IV knew that the South German States would join Austria and he also dreaded Russian intervention. It was thus he gave way to Austria and signed a treaty of Olmutz in November 1850 stipulating for the dissolution of the German Union while restoring the German federation. Prussia bowed her head before Austria and Russia in complete and humiliating surrender. Nationalism in Prussia had found the bitter depths of defeat.

After this humiliation, Prussia concentrated on setting its own house in order. Many Germans were convinced that only Prussia could be the standard bearer of German unity since Liberal movements were crushed. This conviction was entertained not by liberals but by conservatives. The conservatives while opposing the political and economic doctrine of liberals accepted their patriotic fervour and applied it against Austria. This change of mood and outlook, a transition from reliance upon liberal idealism and popular enthusiasm to reliance upon realism and power, was perhaps the most important political result of the failures of 1848. In Germany distrust of liberalism and of parliamentary methods went further and deeper, because the failure of 1848 in Germany had been ever more complete than in Italy; though Prussia needed another decade of reorganization before she could become more clearly the hard core of a new Germany.

Moreover, parliamentary assemblies had gained no credit from the events of 1848-50, whereas it was the armies that had won in the end. When gatherings of enthusiastic middle-class representatives had finished talking, it was the professional armies of Russia, Prussia

- 214 -

and Austria, under their professional generals, which had settled the fate of Europe. Governments would in future rely more on organized military power to achieve their ends. Bismarck's age of 'blood and iron' had begun. For all these reasons the sequel to the era of revolution was an era of authority and realism, of diplomacy and war; and it was in these conditions that a united Italy and a united Germany were at last to appear.

Things began rapidly changing when the new ruler, William I, began a further reform of the Prussian army. Now onwards began the role of individuals in bringing about the unification of Germany. King William chose the gifted General Moltke as his Chief of Staff and von Roon, a remarkable organizer, as Minister of War. The King and his advisers were eager to reform the army but the Lower House of the Prussian Parliament was reluctant as it was responsive to the liberal sentiment. The liberals of the Assembly were anxious to make Prussia a constitutional monarchy with responsible parliamentary government. They also believed that by holding up the financial sanction for military reform they could compel the king to change the constitution as per their liking. These liberals were joined by moderates and republicans to harass the king and his ministers. The king dissolved the House and ordered new elections. This new assembly proved to be more troublesome.

When the king was absolutely at a loss, it was von Roon who suggested that the king should summon Bismarck as minister and it was under Bismarck's guidance that German Unification was finally achieved. Bismarck had no sympathy for the liberals and democrats but he was intensely patriotic and believed in royalty. Before precipitating matters, Bismarck took care to ensure against the danger of foreign intervention on behalf of Austria. From Britain

...../-

he expected no trouble. Britain favoured Russia partly because of free trade policy pursued by the Zollverein in contrast to the protectionist policy of Austria and partly because of the romantic antipathy of English Liberals to any continental power. Bismarck anticipated no trouble from Russia as he knew that the Czar was offended by Austria's refusal to aid Russia during the Crimean War. On the other hand, Bismarck was sure that the Czar were grateful to Prussia because of her offer of assistance to Russia in suppressing the Polish revolt of 1863. Only the attitude of France was problematic one. French opinion was against the establishment of united and powerful Germany on the Rhine. But Bismarck understood the timidity of Napoleon III, as well as the difficulties the French Emperor faced at the moment in far away Mexico and the unpreparedness of France. In order to mollify Napoleon III he visited him at Biarritz to solicit his benevolence and vaguely hint that, if ^{Prussia} were given a free hand in Germany, France might get some compensation. Bismarck knew how to play on the romantic attachment of the French Emperor to the principle of nationality, on his personal vanity, and his readiness to clutch at any chance to obtain a little glory for France and the Napoleonic dynasty.

All the while Bismarck by-passed the Prussian Parliament. He spent money on the army without the parliamentary consent. He showed the least respect for the Diet as well for the ideas of liberty and liberalism. In other words, the German strength grew both in the economic field and in armed might.

Since he had already secured the near neutrality of various powers, he chose to involve Austria in the dispute over the duchies of Schleswig-Holstein. The Germans had relationships with the duchies long back in

history but the occasion for provoking intervention arose when Denmark tried to administratively link the duchies. Bismarck succeeded in enticing Austria to intervene. Both arrived at a settlement on how to administer the duchies known as Gastein Agreement. The deficiencies in the agreement were exploited by Bismarck to enrage Austria. When Austria referred the dispute to the Diet at Frankfurt, Prussia withdrew from the confederation on the ground that Austria and other German states jointly proposed to interfere with her rights. Bismarck proclaimed to the world that Prussia would fight a defensive war against Austria and its German allies for the national union of Germany. So cleverly did Bismarck manage the affair that public opinion abroad believed that Austria was the aggressor.

The new Prussian military regime came out victorious in the Seven Weeks War as clinched by the battle of Sadowa. Austria was obliged to cede Venetia to Italy, pay a small war indemnity, and consent to the dissolution of the German Confederation to be replaced by a North German Confederation with Prussia at its head but without Austria, according to the Treaty of Prague in 1866. Immediately after this treaty, Bismarck succeeded in concluding favourable arrangements with the lesser German states. Some of them he annexed outright in order to round off Prussia's misshapen territories, increase its population and economic resources and strengthen its military position. The duchies of Schleswig-Holstein, the kingdom of Hanover, the duchies of Hesse-Cassel and Nassau and the free city of Frankfurt, were incorporated into Prussia.

Some German states remained outside the new German Confederation. As most of these States except for Bavaria were suspicious of Prussia, Bismarck adopted a conciliatory policy. But he did not miss the opportunity of frightening them with the possibility of French aggression at their

...../-

expense. Indeed, he undertook the responsibility of protecting them by negotiating secret treaties of defensive alliance with Wurttemberg and the grand duchies of Baden and Messe-Darmstadt.

After the victory at Sadowa and a satisfactory agreement with the several German States, Bismarck chose to conciliate the Parliament at home. He sought indemnity from the Parliament for illegally taking the money from the treasury for strengthening the army. Extending more gracefulness, he conceded extension of franchise and freedom of press to some extent.

But Bismarck had one more thing to do. War with France was inevitable. In pursuance of the vague promise that he made to France for its neutrality during Austro-Prussian War, Napoleon III made a few suggestions to Prussia. Bismarck had no intention to fulfil the promise. As the last alternative Napoleon III coveted Luxemburg. The French Government attempted to put pressure on King William. One interview with the king at Ems gave the opportunity for Bismarck to complete the unification of Germany.

The report of the meeting, which was sent to him in the form of a telegram from Ems, was deliberately abridged (to mislead the readers) and published. The publication of the telegram consisting of the meeting between the French ambassador and the Prussian king threw France and Prussia into war hysteria. The Franco-Prussian War, too, was fought and decided in a short period. Napoleon III's rule ended in disgrace. Humiliating the whole French nation, after the victory at Sedan, the German Empire was proclaimed from the palace of Versailles in 1870, and Alsace-Lorraine was taken from France as a natural frontier for the future defence of Germany.

"The Franco-German war made Germany mistress of Europe, and Bismarck master of Germany. The political unification under Prussian leadership for which Bismarck had wages three wars, for which the Revolution of 1848, thinkers and writers, poets, philosophers and histories, had all in their different ways prayed or worked, was at last complete." The emergence of Germany in 1870 and Italy in 1871 sounded the triumph of Real Politik. The unification of both the countries was achieved through brute force, razor-sharp diplomacy, expediency, and militant national urge. Baptized in this manner, neither Germany nor Italy were destined to move on democratic and liberal but on conservative and authoritarian tracks. In the very genesis of nationalism in Germany and Italy lay the seeds for the First World War and later the Second World War.

BISMARCK AND GERMAN UNIFICATION

Bismarck was the pivot on which the whole of European diplomacy revolved from 1862 to 1870. His diplomacy and the lightning wars that he waged exemplified for the first time Real Politik in practice. The political statecraft practised by Bismarck was in a way the product of circumstances. The truth about the circumstances of the day was the hollowness of liberalism and the weakness of nationalism as revealed in the series of revolts from 1815 to 1848.

With this awareness Bismarck concentrated on his home state, Prussia, and on the one smouldering desire of the Germans, that is, patriotism. Paradoxically - the path of nationalism lay ^{through} provincialism and in the strength of one State (Prussia) all the other States of Germany came to be united. Germany could only find herself in Prussia. It was Germany that was merged in Prussia, not Prussia in Germany. Germany ^{moved} to Berlin; whereas, in Italy, Sardinia moved to Rome.

Bismarck possessed the needed clear vision and resolution that was needed for the unification of Germany. Bismarck belonged to the most influential and social class in Prussia, who for centuries divided their attention between their own landed estates and the service of their Hohenzollern sovereigns. Born some 40 miles to the west of Berlin, Bismarck combined in himself the aristocratic traditions of his class with the enthusiastic patriotism stimulated by Prussia's role in the overthrow of Napoleon.

Before becoming the member of the Diet in 1851, he gained some experience which sharpened his mental faculties. During his short stay in the Civil Service, he was repelled by the petty tedious business of quill-driving of 'piptail' and 'poriwig'. During his ambassadorial

assignment he cultivated friendship with Czar Alexander II. In this role he strengthened the entente between Prussia and Russia. While in Paris as the Prussian ambassador for a few months during 1862, he gained an accurate insight into the nature of Napoleon III. While being the member of the Diet, he knew how to assert himself since he realized that Prussian interests were bound up with the strength of Germany while Austria's with its weakness. He did not neglect the significant detail. The assumption of Austrian superiority could be challenged by the lighting of a cigar and the Habsburg empire defied by the removing of a coat. Apart from keeping Austria in its place, he acquired an unrivalled knowledge of general German politics.

There were two more experiences of Bismarck before he was chosen as the Minister of King in 1862. He showed his contempt for the travails of the Frankfurt Parliament. He claimed that Germany was drowned in the "putrid yeast of South German anarchy" and feared that ancestral Prussianism would be "dissolved in the mongrel German unity". In his words, "Prussian honour does not consist in Prussia's playing the ^{Don quixote} ~~Don quixote~~ all over Germany for the benefit of sickly demagogues who consider their constitution in danger." During the upheaval of 1848-49 Bismarck consistently defended the existing Prussian State against the liberals. Not by speeches and majority votes are the great questions of the day decided that was the mistake of 1848 and 1849 - but by blood and iron. This was the keynote of his realism and success.

More important was the knowledge that he acquired in playing with lies and half-lies. "The marked contempt of later years for the sincerity of public opinion, for newspapers, for journalism, who could always be bought, for all the dark magic of an official Press bureau, for

...../-

diplomatic reconnaissances by the circulation of lies, for lashing up public sentiment by dictated paragraphs inserted in avowedly independent journals -- all this can be traced to his Frankfurt period." During the critical period of King's confrontation with parliament, Bismarck offered to bring his peasants to Berlin to protect Frederick William IV; and, when the king promised the grant of a Prussian constitution, Bismarck voted in a minority of two against returning thanks. He scoffed at the efforts of Frankfurt Assembly to unify Germany and a platform of constitutional liberties, and rejoiced at the refusal of Frederick William to take the Imperial Crown from the gutter.

One more thing before becoming the Minister that Bismarck did was in excluding Austria from the Zollverein. Austria was anxious, having at last realized its significance, to enter or destroy it. Bismarck effectively checkmated this move of Austria. Also he was largely instrumental in preventing Prussia from adopting pro-Austrian policy during the Crimean War.

The occasion for calling Bismarck by King William I in 1862 arose when the German Lower House obstructed the re-organization of armed forces on which the king had set his mind. Here it may be noted that Prussia, which Bismarck piloted, was not the same as it was till 1850. Prussia after 1850 had grown stronger in everything except self-confidence. By 1850 the work of Stein and Scharnhorst had set Prussian internal economy on a new civil and military basis. When the king summoned Bismarck he was persuaded to do so by von Roon. It was a desperate remedy; for, the king had not wholly given his confidence to this man of large visions, independent views, immense power and bold and shocking decisions. The Queen, too, was against him; but urgent necessity was the master of the

hour. Bismarck was the only man with the will and capacity to stand by the king against the Parliament even to the end -- "The thought of perishing with him seemed a natural and congenial conclusion to my life." On September 23, 1862 King William committed himself and Prussia into the hands of the boldest and most skilful statesman of the age with which a new era began in the history of Europe.

With Bismarck becoming the Minister of Prussia, the breach between the Parliament and the Crown became complete. The Ministers of the Crown no longer attended the sittings of the "House of Phrases". The personal feeling against Bismarck was so great that he was advised by his friends to transfer his property to his brother. One of his strongest opponents he challenged to a duel, which was, however, refused. Bismarck remarked, "Men spat on the place where he trod in the streets". For four years he stood with his back to the wall, fighting with the Parliament and the people, resting for authority solely on the royal support, trusting in Roon's sympathy, his only friend, and carrying on the government without a budget while leaving the vindication of his policy to the future.

Before he played his major cards in foreign affairs, the first gambit of Bismarck was the Polish Rebellion of 1863. The Poles won the sympathy of half Europe. Napoleon III was friendly to the countrymen of Chopin. The Prussian Liberals were enthusiastic for the Poles. Bismarck opposed it. He argued that there were Poles in Prussia, who might be infected by a successful Polish Revolution. He remarked, "The inclination to make sacrifices to foreign nationalities at the expense of the fatherland is a political disease, peculiar to Germany". But Bismarck bought the friendship of Russia by defying

...../-

the revolutionary committees spread from Warsaw to Barcelona, which sentenced him to death, and the Prussian Liberals who committed him to national execration.

This event was only a prelude to what has yet to come about. Bismarck had no illusions that the Prussian triumph could be achieved by compromise or persuasion. While keeping the Parliament in Prussia in virtual abeyance muzzling the press, taking the money illegally from the treasury for the army. Bismarck went ahead with his plans. First he chose to test his own military strength in the context of the Danish duchies of Schleswig-Holstein. The link between these duchies and Denmark was only with the Danish Crown, but not with the Danish State. The duchies were principalities of the Danish royal family and related to Denmark as some of the Habsburg dominions to Austria. Long back Prussia claimed them as German territories. Through great Power intervention the ruler of Denmark was given sovereignty over them. In 1863 when an attempt was made to unify them with the political institution of Denmark Prussia and Austria opposed the move since neither of them would be outdone by the other bidding for leadership of the German cause. The controversy regarding the duchies was extremely nebulous. Palmerston remarked that only three people were fully acquainted with the truth: the prince Consort of England, who was dead; a German professor, who was in a lunatic asylum; and himself, but, he had forgotten it.

Skating on such thin ice Bismarck enticed Austria to intervene in the affairs of the duchies. In interfering with this affair first he was testing the efficiency of the Prussian military establishment. Second, he was gauging European opinion and the extent to which they can be isolated. Third, the victory would help him silence his opponents in Prussia. Fourth, the joint Austro-Prussian

...../-

exercise against /- would negate the idea of German confederation as legally Prussia and Austria had no right to declare war without the sanction of the Diet of German confederation. Fifth, he coveted the duchies. Finally, he calculated that the arrangement of duchies after the victory would contain germs of discord between Austria and Prussia providing him an opportunity to drive out Austria from Germany.

Now onwards Bismarck deliberately set himself to produce a war by exploiting the points of discord in the Gastein arrangement. Before precipitating the war with Austria, Bismarck took care to ensure isolation of other Powers. Knowing that Austria was the principal architect of the German confederation which came into existence under the guarantee of great Power of Europe, Bismarck carefully made his calculations. From Britain no trouble could be expected as British opinion was favourable to Prussia. No trouble need be expected from Russia also as she was offended by Austria's refusal to aid her during the Crimean War; and, on the other hand, Russia was grateful to Prussia for its support in suppressing the Polish Revolt of 1863. From Italy Bismarck could expect more than neutrality. Italy at least wanted to acquire Venetia. Italy eagerly responded to the overtures of Bismarck. Thus France alone remained a problem. French opinion was definitely anti-Prussia. France would never welcome a powerful Germany on the Rhine. Bismarck understanding the character of Napoleon III gambled on his timidity. Bismarck took the trouble of visiting Napoleon III at Biarritz to solicit his goodwill and vaguely hinted some compensation to Prussia. No one knows what exactly happened. It was a confidential talk. There were no witnesses, save the dog, Nero, who followed at their heels. From the meagre and partisan records the conclusion that we can arrive at is that Bismarck freely offered what did

not belong to him. He suggested that France should seek adjustment in French-speaking territories such as South-eastern Belgium.

Now onwards it was a question of provoking Austria to war. Bismarck fomented intrigues against the Austrian administration in Holstein. When Austria was not able to obtain satisfaction from Bismarck, took the complain to the Frankfurt Diet of the German Confederation. Now Bismarck got his chance. He declared that Austria thereby violated the Convention of Gastein and sent troops to occupy Holstein to oust the Austrian officials. Thus provoked by Bismarck and Prussia, Austria wanted general mobilisation throughout Germany to restrain Prussia from interfering with Austrian rights. The Diet showed sympathy for Austria and the members voted accordingly. This action was interpreted by Bismarck as something equal to a joint attack on Prussia by the other German States. He broke away from the federation and proclaimed that Prussia would fight a defensive war for the national union of Germany. A brief war began in 1866.

In the forced war of seven weeks war on Austria. Prussia had won the famous battle of Sadowa. King William, totally carried away by his soldierly instincts saw in the victory a righteous Prussian crusade against an aggressive Austria, whom God had delivered for chastisement into the hands of the Hohenzollern. But Bismarck was opposed to this. He was made to fight a silent battle with the king. He anticipated a time when the friendship with Austria might prove helpful to his projects. Wisely he avoided to prolong the conflict and to take ruthless advantage of the victory of Sadowa which had already alarmed the powers of Europe. Bismarck considered that the essential objects of war were already won: the reconstruction of Germany under a dominant Prussia, and the exclusion of Austria from any part in it.

In his words, "Austria's rivalry of Prussia is no more culpable than Prussia's rivalry of Austria. Our business is to establish German national unity under the leadership of the kind of Prussia". Events soon proved Bismarck to be right.

But this victory of Prussia at Sadowa foreboded ill for the future. The great thesis which the historian Treitschke was spending his life and art in demonstrating from professorial chairs seemed to have been proved in action, that Prussia was the supreme product of the German race and the Teutonic civilization. But when Prussia triumphed Prussianism triumphed with her - and that has been the price which Germany and Europe have paid for Bismarck's victories. The national militant became the nation triumphant, and militant nationalism was justified of its children.

Immediately after this event, instead of being intoxicated by his new popularity and taking revenge on the Parliament, Bismarck after restoring the full operation of the Prussian parliament, graciously asked, after another tussle with the king and the diehards, for an indemnity for his previous defiance of the constitution (for all the wanton illegalities that he was guilty of during the preceding four years). It was overwhelmingly voted. In the same year, he sponsored the provision in the new constitution of the North German Confederation that its Reichstag should be elected by direct and universal manhood suffrage. To this there was objection from some Prussian conservatives, but he assured them that the German masses would be more conservative than the middle class and more patriotically devoted to the maintenance of a strong central government. As a result of these popular concessions, a new political party took shape, the National Liberal Party. It was

...../-

recruited largely from the bourgeoisie and in many instances from former Progressives. Bismarck confused all principles, as he dissolved all parties.

A few radicals remained intransigent. But the mainstream of political activity was swept away and a new party came into existence called National Liberals. The dominant policy of this party for the next 12 years was not Prussian Liberalism or German Nationalism, but, in one word, Bismarck, the epitome of German patriotism.

Now for the third spectacular diplomatic and military victory of Bismarck. Deep rivalry existed between the two countries, France and Prussia. The startling growth of Prussian power was an undoubted challenge to France. Prussia's victory was a menace to French international prestige and possibly to her national security. Prussia, on the other hand, resented the sense of grievance felt by France. An occasion for dispute was speedily grabbed. Napoleon III, egged on by his Ministers, made a proposal to Bismarck in pursuance of the vague promise made by him at Biarritz before the Austro-Prussian war. This was rejected. Then Napoleon III turned to the idea of Belgium. Another dangerous document in the French ambassador's handwriting was added to Bismarck's collection. Bismarck played for time and the negotiations went no further. Then Napoleon III made his last bid for Luxemburg, which was with the king of Holland. For some time it was a member of the German Confederation and the Zollverein. France demanded the removal of Prussian troops. Holland showed its willingness to sell it provided the King of Prussia gave his consent. Bismarck kept quiet. Soon passions were roused in Germany. The Germans cried that the land which is essentially German must not fall into the hands of hereditary enemies. The unification of Germany must go no farther, cried the French. The King of

Holland now refused to sell it. Napoleon complained that Bismarck duped him. When this affair came to be known to European powers, they were shocked by the chicanery of France. Prussia suggested an European Congress. Luxemburg was declared a neutral state. In Paris it was called a French triumph, in Berlin, a German victory. The crisis passed without war.

In the coming three years the atmosphere was heavy with the threatening storm. Napoleon III reduced his contingent of conscripts for the year 1870 but suddenly in July the storm broke out. It was least expected. After the exile of the Queen of Spain, the Spanish Government offered the throne to Prince Leopold who was related both to the Habsburgs and the Bonapartes. Bismarck dismissed it as an affair of the royalty. Leopold did not agree to accept the offer. But after some time he changed his opinion. At this stage, the French Government expressed its disapproval of the candidature. The newspapers of Paris talked of the German threat to the balance of power and the safety of France. Then, France desired the withdrawal of the candidate in an offensive and an irritating manner which made her appear as the aggressor in the war that followed. The French ambassador met the King of Prussia at Ems. He demanded that he should support France. The King favoured a peaceful resolution while protesting against the hostile speeches of the French. The King even advised the withdrawal of the candidature. Napoleon III believed that the danger of war had passed. But the French military party wanted war as much as Bismarck and his army leaders. Once again the French ambassador was sent to the King of Prussia with the demand that the Hohenzollern candidature should never be renewed. They even wanted the King to sign a draft letter of apology. It was a great insult to the Prussian nation and the monarch. The King put an end to the interview with the French ambassador.

...../-

France was satisfied but the next devilish move came from Bismarck. He was convinced that war was a necessity. When he received the news of the withdrawal of the candidature, Bismarck grew depressed. Both Moltke and Roon were with him. Bismarck wanted to resign while the two soldiers complained of their professional inability to do so. At that time a telegram came from Ems with an account of the king's interview with the French ambassador. As Bismarck read it the disgust of the two guests was so great that they turned away from food and drink. Then a thought occurred to Bismarck. After asking a few questions of Moltke, he made up his mind to publish the telegram in a shortened form. All the three knew that it would provoke France. Hopefully they fell to eating and drinking again. The effect of the publication of the telegram was as Bismarck had anticipated. War became a reality. Even Bavaria, the traditional ally of France, went over to Prussia. Diplomatically too, France was isolated. Bismarck published the draft treaty proposing the French conquest of Belgium. Britain was alarmed by the French unscrupulousness. One by one the countries of Europe declared their neutrality. When Austria hesitated, Russia put pressure on her and scotched the prospect of any Franco-Austrian alliance. Italy coveting Rome joined Prussia. After a fortnight, actual war broke out.

Just as the Prussian statesman had anticipated, the fact that south Germans fought in the war shoulder to shoulder with North Germans aroused all over Germany a popular patriotic ardor strong enough to overcome princely jealousies and liberal scruples. By November 1870, while the war was still in progress, treaties of union were negotiated by Bismarck on behalf of the North German Confederation with the governments of the several South German states. These treaties, duly ratified by the

respective sovereigns and parliaments, simply extended the North German Confederation so as to include the southern states and changed its name to the "German Empire". The king of Prussia, instead of being "President of the Confederation", was henceforth to be styled "German Emperor".

By a curious irony of fate, the solemn ceremony of inaugurating the German Empire was held on January 18, 1871, exactly 170 years after the Prussian Hohenzollerns assumed the title of King; and as the Germans were still besieging Paris, the ceremony was held in the hall of mirrors in the palace of Louis XIV at Versailles, "in the ancient centre" the official report explained, "of a hostile power which for centuries had striven to divide and humiliate Germany". The choice of Versailles for the ceremony was unfortunate; the French did not forgive the Germans till the days of deGaulle and Podenauer.

In one respect, Bismarck, as later events disclosed, over-reached himself. That was in the taking of Alsace-Lorraine from France. He took the provinces for patriotic and military reasons. His military advisers pointed out that the new frontier of the Vosges Mountains would be easier for Germany to defend in another war with France than the old frontier of the Rhine River and that the fortresses of Strasbourg and Mainz would provide additional security for Germany. Besides, Bismarck heeded the pleas of German patriots that the provinces had belonged to the medieval German Empire, that their "re-annexation" to Germany would strengthen the new Empire. Nevertheless, a large majority of the people of Alsace-Lorraine in 1871, regardless of what language they might speak, showed themselves French and not German in national sentiment; their

.../

elected representatives protested against the compulsory
recession of the provinces. The policy of revanche
pursued by France after 1870 led ultimately to the
First world War.

ROLE OF COAL AND IRON IN THE
UNIFICATION OF GERMANY

Metaphorically speaking coal and iron stand for the economic strength of a nation in modern times. The rapid growth of the German economy after the end of the Napoleonic era in a very unobtrusive manner contributed for the origin of forces and factors that laid the base for German unification. At the political level the process of German unification was protracted and identified with Machiavellian diplomacy and war, centered in the leadership of one State, Prussia, and it was the ^{personal} triumph of king William and his great Minister Bismarck who won a series of diplomatic and military victories. In other words, the contribution of economic strength constitute the base on which the spectacular political events of the nineteenth century occurred as led by the strong personalities of William and Bismarck resulting in the unification of Germany.

In a general sense the 1840s which were barren in politics, except for the abortive attempts of the Liberals in 1848, were of the greatest importance in economic history. Industrial capitalism picked up momentum in Central Europe. First, national energies, frustrated in political matters time and again, came to be canalized for attaining material progress. Second, the victory of the reactionary forces helped economic expansion of the day because the business community were not deterred by the fear of mob violence and social upheaval. Third, the influx of gold from America and Australia generated an inflationary tendency encouraging speculative boom. The value of industrial production and foreign trade in the Zollverein more than doubled in the course of the decade. New investment banks based on the joint-stock principle provided the capital ^{capital} factories and railways. Indeed,

...../-

the economic system was jolted by the financial crash of 1857 but the industrial sector was able to absorb the shock. Perceptibly after 1871, the domination of Reichs Bank welded the German banks into formidable financial power.

Germany crossed the dividing line between pre-industrial and industrial forms of economy by the close of 40s. This had a profound effect on the direction of politics. Wealth continued to shift from farming to manufacture, from the country to the city, and from the aristocracy to the bourgeoisie. The pressure for re-distribution of political power also gained strength. By the close of the decade, the struggle between the forces of liberalism and conservatism surfaced up. This lay at the genesis of the Frankfurt Assembly. Here history took a queer turn. The liberal democratic forces which emerged in the wake of industrialisation were disgraced by 1849. This discomfiture of the new social forces was utilised by the conservative forces (represented by William and Bismarck) to achieve the unification of Germany on patriotic lines, but not democratic and liberal. Even then, one should not forget the fact that the economic strength proved advantageous for the military encounters which led towards the unification of Germany, were encouraged by the conservatives.

This particular feature becomes very clear when we refer to the railways. By 1850 the Prussian territory had almost the same length of the railway track as that of France. This enabled Germany to exploit her great mineral resources of coal and lignite to a point when her annual output exceeded that of France and Belgium. Between 1860-1870 her output of iron increased even more rapidly.

...../-

East of the Rhine, railways came more slowly and piecemeal, and the corresponding advances in manufacturing spread gradually. The economist, Friedrich List, just back from America, argued in favour of general German system of railways. At first he succeeded in having a line built in Saxony from Leipzig to Dresden, which began in 1839. In its first year it carried 412,000 people, some lady travellers keeping needles in their mouths to prevent familiarity in the darkness of its single tunnel. List's persuasive propaganda played a part in overcoming the doubts, hesitations, and frank hostility of many of the existing forces in Germany, and the crown prince of Prussia (the future of Frederick William IV) became an enthusiastic supporter. The revolutionary effect of the railway was even greater in some respects on German life than on life in more industrialized countries like Britain and Belgium. With a road system that was so imperfect, the changes brought by the railways were more obvious and more spectacular. Country people were shaken more abruptly out of their traditional outlooks and habits. Germany was set to become the centre of the continental system of transport and distribution in a way inconceivable hitherto. Her natural geographical and political characteristics had operated in the opposite direction: a small coastline discouraged shipping; the flow of many of her rivers to the closed sea of the Baltic, the freezing of her canals in winter, her backward roads, had all made transport difficult, while her tangle of internal customs and tolls had made it expensive. The new iron tracks opened up the interior lands of Germany as they were opening up the interior of America, exposing them to new forces, bringing a new stimulus to trade, offering new opportunities to men of enterprise in every sphere of business. Just as the Zollverein removed the ^{artificial} impediments, so the railways

...../-

removed the natural impediments to German integration and prosperity. They made possible the rapid expansion of the German economy after 1850, and paved the way for political unification of Germany. At the same time they gave her an enhanced importance in Europe, as the central power par excellence, and within that new era Prussia held all the advantages as against Austria, for future leadership and domination.

The development of both railways and industries was mainly carried out by private capital in Prussia by the States and other princely States. It is the Prussian government that fully appreciated their military uses. Military strategy, guided by Moltke, was devised to take full advantage of the new speed with which troops and supplies could be moved. Moreover, the manufacture of heavy artillery, which industrial revolution made possible, transformed field warfare. Thus, without the rapid economic development German nationalism would have been a much weaker force. It would have triumphed otherwise too, because of William and Bismarck, but as a movement it would have drawn less support in a critical period from the most progressive section of public opinion throughout Germany.

These rapid developments in the economic field changed the mental outlook of the people, an outlook which facilitated the work of William and Bismarck. They drew strength from the natural desires of the growing class of liberal-minded entrepreneurs who wanted to throw out legal and administrative arrangements of an old-fashioned order, open up new supplies of free labour and larger free-trade markets, and claim political power through more and more liberal and parliamentary methods.

...../-

Behind all these developments in the economic field was the Zollverein. The starting point of the Zollverein lay in the financial reforms initiated by Prussia in 1818, in accordance with the principles of Adam Smith. In order to unite the scattered provinces of Prussia, the Prussian Minister Maassen created a new tariff system which abolished all internal customs and established free trade throughout Prussian territory. In the case of foreign imports a moderate tariff was levied on manufactured goods, but no tariff whatever was imposed on raw materials. On the other hand, transport duties on commodities conveyed through Prussia were made very high in order to compel other States to enter the Customs Union.

This policy was fatal to the independence of the secondary States, which were confronted with economic ruin if they endeavoured to hold aloof from the Prussian system; for not only did the scattered territories of Prussia completely envelop a number of German principalities, but through them passed the chief commercial routes of Germany. Prussia, however, refused to take heed of the outcry raised against her, while Austria -- failing to grasp the immense issues involved -- remained passive. Rival commercial unions were formed, but the liberal terms offered by Prussia after 1825, gradually broke down all opposition; and one State after another attached itself to her Union. In 1834 the important States of Bavaria, Wurtemberg, and Saxony entered the Zollverein, and the system eventually extended over the whole of Germany.

The effects on Germany of such a widespread union were many.

- (a) The agreement on which the Zollverein was based was not a treaty concerned mainly with events of the past: it was a vital reality, affecting the daily

life of every member. Thus, imperceptibly but surely the member-states were drawn intimately together, their intimacy being further promoted by the opening up of railways, canals and roads to facilitate transport between them.

- (b) German territories, excluding Austria, became one economic entity. Economic unity thus created broke the political barriers and paved the way for German political unity and community of material interests, stimulated the growth of national feeling, and fostered national consciousness.
- (c) The German industrialists, businessmen, mine owners, steel barons and railway builders became a powerful force working for national unity. They desired the uniformity of laws, of taxes, tariffs, postal service, currency, weights and measures which would follow political union and they desired even more the support and protection in foreign lands which a powerful government could command for them. (The 1848 revolution in Germany can be seen as an attempt by the upper middle class to obtain political power, since the creation of the Zollverein, its economic situation conferred on it.)
- (d) The Zollverein was an economic weapon in Prussia's political struggle for primacy in Germany. Prussia might be too weak to take on Austria militarily, as Olmutz demonstrated, but economically Prussia with every year that passed grew stronger and could force the smaller German States to her side taking them away from the more protectionist Austria. For the German States trade with Prussia was crucial economically, they could not afford to ^{stay} outside the system and be in trade rivalry with the Zollverein States. The Zollverein accustomed the

...../-

German States and the people to cooperation without Austria; it taught them the advantages of Prussian leadership. Therefore, they favoured the establishment of a national government under the initiative of Prussia and on the Prussian model.

- (e) The large Prussian military system with new types of guns and the efficient mobilization of 1,830,000 troops - regulars and reservists in 1870 through German barracks within a period of 18 days and transportation of 46,200 troops to the western frontier (almost twice the size of the force mustered in France, where 23 days after the beginning of mobilization, reservists were still straggling into their regimental headquarters often without the most essential items of uniform and equipment) itself were the results of Prussian industrialization and a transport (particularly railways) revolution (hence the role of coal and iron).

It is indeed difficult to establish a direct link between iron and coal and the unification of Germany. Nevertheless, we cannot deny both the direct and indirect impact of the economic revolution on the unification of Germany..

RISE OF LIBERALISM IN BRITAIN IN THE 19TH CENTURY

Liberalism was not born on a particular date in the 19th century. It was more a consummation of certain traits present in various civilizations dating back to the pre-Christian era. Although Britain herself cannot lay claim for fathering the thinking of liberalism, it was in Britain that the liberal thought or ideology matured in the 19th century.

The hub of liberal thought is individualism. Down from the days of the Old Testament and passing through Socratic times and the age of Christianity, one struggle of man appeared quite prominently, and it was the importance of the individuality of man, the liberation of the individual from total subservience to any collectivity, and relaxation of the hold of custom, law and authority. This individualistic urge of man was given a stimulus both by Renaissance (re-learning the Greek heritage) and Reformation (individual claiming the moral right to realise the word of God with the help of the Bible instead of the intermediary like the priest and the papacy). Consequently, the struggle of man in asserting his individuality appears from the 16th century onwards in the form of religious rebels or heretics, explorers, conquerors, buccanners and even pirates.

This thirst of man for identity and freedom received a stimulus when the Mercantilist thought gained wider and wider currency in the States located on the Atlantic sea-board. One immediate consequence of this desire of man was the conflict between the Parliament and the King in England in the 17th century. The Glorious Revolution of 1688 marked a phase in the struggle for human identity and individuality. It received a theoretical justification in the hands of writers like Hobbes and Locke and jurists like Coke and individual rebels

like Hampden, Pym and Eliot. The common feature in the perspectives of these representatives of 17th-century Britain was a desire to limit the authority of the Government. And from the revolution of 1688 onwards individuality was on the ascendancy at the expense of the absoluteness or the authoritarianism of the king. By the end of the 18th century, the king was virtually reduced to a nominal head, while the Cabinet, a creation of Parliament, became the real executive.

In defence of this political revolution, a few thinkers appeared in Britain by the close of the century. Bentham's sole advice to the State was: Be quiet. Edmund Burke stated that the State could do very little positive good. Thomas Paine, the eloquent pamphleteer for the American Revolution, wrote that even the best State was at best a necessary evil. Generations of Americans ritualistically repeated Thomas Jefferson's advice "that Government is the best that governs the least".

While the political development went apace in the 17th and 18th centuries, in Britain the importance of the individual became the lynchpin of both political activity and economic thought. Mercantilism supported the freedom of the individual to pursue wealth while the State welcomed it for strengthening it at the expense of the feudal order; but in the 18th century appeared Adam Smith, the great champion of free trade, i.e. economic activity should be least subject to State interference. The liberal economic thinkers believed that the government must not do for the individual what he is able to do for himself. The famous jurist Dickey criticised Britain's Ten Hour Act (1847) which limited the labour of women and children as a socialistic measure as late as 1905.

A far more important feature of the free trade doctrine was the belief in the sanctity of private property.

The eminent philosopher, Locke, maintained that right to property is an inalienable natural right of man. He even argued that the individual ought to rebel as a moral duty if the right to property is violated by the government. Prior to Locke, another eminent thinker of the 17th century, Thomas Hobbes, argued that the possessive urge in man is a natural quality. In order to satisfy his egoism, man would not stop at anything except the fear of death. Such being human nature, the State necessarily assumes absolute power to keep each individual in his rightful place and thereby promotes trade, commerce, art and science which come to a standstill when each individual is at war with every other individual. Although the philosophy of Hobbes might be taken as an apology for absolute monarchy, it can also be regarded as a philosophy which lays bare the spirit of capitalism or the spirit of the individual claiming right to property.

In this manner, by the time Britain entered the 19th century, many things happened and a lot of thinking had gone into liberalism to justify it as a doctrine worth believing in or striving for. As from the 17th and 18th centuries great changes occurred in trade and commerce leading to the industrial and agricultural revolutions, the whole socio-economic climate of Britain was greatly transformed. Population grew while two new classes emerged, called the middle and working classes. The conditions in which the working class community lived was quite deplorable -- lived in ghettos, received low wages, uprooted from villages, while the State did nothing either to protect their interests or to provide them with elementary welfare measures like sanitation, medical care and educational facilities.

In such a socio-economic situation, it was but natural for any country to seek an answer to them. Impelled by the challenge, liberalism ventured to provide

an answer. Bentham argued in favour of various measures for the sake of improving the general lot of the people. He even pleaded for manhood franchise and secret ballot. His successor John Stuart Mill argued in favour of universal franchise and some restraints on the right to property. At one time he went on record stating that he was almost converted to the socialism of St. Simon. Indeed he is more known as the champion of individual liberty and women's emancipation rather than the rights of the working community.

religious field, which, too, had a bearing on the liberal philosophy of the 19th century. In the 18th century, the established Church known as the Anglican Church became indolent. The priest smoked his pipe and read the newspapers, which were in vogue, while neglecting his religious duties. As a protest against the lethargy of the established Church, a group of young people started a movement known as the Methodists. The Methodists aimed to bring the message of God to the underdog in society. They addressed massive gatherings of peasants and miners in their own areas of working. As Methodism gained momentum, some middle class and aristocratic individuals were convinced of the injustice of the day and they soon pleaded for a host of social reforms. These men were known as the Evangelicals of the 19th century. Seeing that their thunder was stolen, the established Church, too, started setting its own house in order in early 19th century, leading to the emergence of two sects known as the High Churchmen and the Low Churchmen. Both these groups of people also grew interested in the social reforms of the day, and one of them was Gladstone, a High Churchman, known for his reformist zeal.

Besides these two major religious movements, 19th-century Britain witnessed two more sects known as the Christian Socialists, otherwise known as the Muscular Socialists, and the Salvation Army. The latter simply wanted to bring theoretical solace to the wretched in urban areas; while the former championed the cause of the deprived in the name of Christianity.

Since the religious awakening of the 19th century was quite extensive, it too influenced the liberal thinkers and reformers of the period. In other words, a religious dimension came to guide the liberal thought of the day.

✕ Talking of the concrete achievements or developments in the 19th century, they can be grouped under

various categories: relating to empire, relating to government, relating to society, and relating to workers in particular. In a way, 19th-century Britain witnessed a spate of reforms and changes which alleviated the accumulated distress of the 17th and 18th centuries.

□ In the context of the empire, Britain started relaxing its control over its possessions and some representatives of Britain working overseas introduced measures leading to profound changes in the concerned countries. Britain lost the American colonies because she adhered to Mercantilist principles. Drawing a lesson from this experience, Britain gradually relaxed its control over its Canadian possession from 1839 onwards and the Canadian Act of 1867 symbolised the first stage in the evolution of dominion status in the British empire. Britain even came to the point of surrendering parts of its empire. Gladstone was the passionate champion of home rule for Ireland: for this cause, he broke up his Liberal Party and even sacrificed the office of Prime Minister. It was a sense of righteousness that made him in all his four Ministries to champion relaxation of control over subject people till his death and that was in the 80s of his life.

Interestingly, some representatives of liberal thought in India were instrumental for the 19th-century awakening in India as well as the emergence of the Indian National Congress. Bentinck was the direct representative of James Mill, one of the liberal thinkers of the 19th century. Inspired by liberal thinking, Bentinck caused the abolition of sati and thuggee and supported the report pleading for the introduction of English as a medium of instruction in educational institutions. In the 80s, Lord Ripon was an admirer and disciple of Gladstone. It was during the days of Ripon that press censorship was relaxed enabling the vernacular press

to come up. He half succeeded in abolishing the invidious distinction between Europeans and Indians in the administration of justice. More important was his famous local self government resolution which aimed to establish local self-government institutions for the purpose of giving training to Indians in the art of self-government. It is important to note that it was Ripon who first talked of self-government even before any Indian laid claim to it. In brief, liberal thought acted as a catalyst in transforming the attitude of subject peoples in all parts of the British empire.

□ Talking of the liberal contribution to government, we have mentioned the change of limited government into almost a representative government in the 19th century. Liberals and evangelicals were the real driving forces behind the first Reform Act of 1832. This Act cleared a lot of dead wood and gave the right to vote to the middle class people. The second Reform Act of 1867 passed by Disraeli (first initiated by the liberal Gladstone) extended the voting right to the urban working community. The third Reform Act of 1884 extended the principle of right to vote to agricultural workers. Also, this century witnessed the Ballot Act, i.e. secret ballot. Thus, manhood franchise came into existence by the end of the 19th century.

□ Concerning the community in general, the liberals were instrumental for ending certain ugly practices and introducing welfare measures for the whole community. Slave trade was abolished; schools were reorganised and extended. For the first time, Health Acts were passed. Prisons were reformed. Law was simplified. And the State actively helped the industrial and agricultural revolutions which gained greater and greater momentum in the 19th century.

□ Finally, talking of the good that was done by the liberals to the deprived of society, we must take note of the improvements that were brought about by factory legislation, working-hours legislation, prohibition of children and women till a particular age from being employed in mines and factories, and ameliorating the conditions of orphans. Prior to this legislation, the plight of British workers was terrible. Working hours in mines varied from 16 to 18 and naked women hauled coal buckets in extremely hazardous conditions. Children were extensively employed in various fields of economic activity, including domestic service for tasks like sweeping chimneys. The wages were low, the living conditions were nearly unimaginable -- lack of sanitation, health and education facilities -- worsened by heavy drinking. By the end of the 19th century, all those evils were ended and the plight of the workers was considerably improved. More important was the Trade Union Act that was passed by the ministry of Disraeli, an evangelical, which is regarded as the Magna Carta of workers. Furthermore, the workers made their entry into the parliament. Keir Hardie was the first socialist to enter the parliament in 1892. As he entered the Westminster Abbey with his miner's cap, he was loudly cheered by the Members of Parliament. The repeal of Corn Laws in 1849 primarily because of the agitation organised by the two liberals Cobden and Bright. The repeal of these laws facilitated the import of cheap corn which led to low-priced bread. Relieved of so many burdens and benefited by the spread of education and other facilities provided by government, the workers began to assert themselves in the political field also. By the end of the 19th century a political party came into existence to represent the interests of

workers; and in 1906 the Labour Party came into existence.

In brief, liberalism was instrumental for changing both the nature and texture of British society in the 19th century. These changes became more ripe in the 20th century. In a way, liberalism constitutes the base on which all the progressive structures of the 20th century are being raised.

RUSSIA

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

"Man is born free but everywhere he is in chains", wrote Rousseau. Marx wrote in 1848, "The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workingmen of all countries, unite". The significance of these two statements is revealed in the Russian Revolution of 1917 - It was a Marxist socialist revolution, aiming to install a dictatorship of the proletariat, which, after withering away, would lead to the communist ideal known as communism. In other words, Russian Revolution is a symbolic continuation of the French Revolution because the latter was a revolution of the bourgeoisie against the obsolete feudal order and arbitrary monarchy.

Indeed Czarist Russia was not ripe for proletarian revolution as the industrial base of Russia was of meagre nature. However, in the lead that was given by the revolutionaries, workers played a prominent part and that too those of the workers who were sufficiently indoctrinated in the Marxist thought.

The remarkable significance of the Russian Revolution was that it was a pre-planned event. In a way the wish of Marx was fulfilled. Marx went on record that hitherto philosophers had interpreted history but philosophers of the future should change the course of history. In his own lifetime Marx did establish communist organizations for the purpose of fomenting revolutions. Although none of his attempts bore fruit, it was Lenin who fulfilled the desire of Marx when he led the revolution from 1917 to 1924 as its undisputed leader. In other words, it was a text-book revolution.

The third significance of the Russian Revolution was that at no time in history a single individual was responsible for a mighty revolution, except the Russian Revolution. None of the revolutions of the past like the Civil War in England, the American War of Independence and the French Revolution were conceived and piloted by a single individual just as Lenin did. Neither the royalists nor the parliamentarians in the 17th century England wanted to precipitate a crisis, but events led the parliamentarians from one extreme to another extreme ending in the execution of Charles I and the establishment of a Puritan dictatorship. In the same manner, neither those who stormed the Bastille in France, nor the enthusiasts among the clergy and nobility who ended the ancient order overnight, did ever foresee the Reign of Terror and the ultimate monarchical ambition of Napoleon. The same was true of the American Revolution since significantly one of the signatories of the American Declaration of Independence was an arch smuggler by name John Hancock, who deliberately signed his name in all capital letters and that too big in size so that George III, the king of England, could read his signature without the help of spectacles! Contrary to all these revolutions was the Russian Revolution of 1917 since Lenin knew that he would bring about a revolution and did plan every step of the revolution. The Germans had a premonition of it. That was how the Germans permitted Lenin, who was living in exile in Switzerland at that time, to leave for his country. In order to keep it a secret, they transported Lenin in sealed train through Germany till the frontiers of Russia! Later events confirmed the German hope.

Next in importance or significance was the text-book nature of the Russian Revolution. From the day the ship, Arora, opened its guns on Leningrad till the formulation of the first five-year plan in 1928, the leaders of the

revolution were constantly guided by what Marx and Engels wrote as well as how Lenin interpreted Marxism in his prolific writings. "Lenin combined the most rigid orthodoxy in doctrine with great flexibility in practice. In fact his practice often preceded his theories, but his orthodoxy prevented him from candidly acknowledging the changes he was making in his Marxian source. Characteristically he tied the two together with an interpretation designed to show that Marx always 'really' meant what Lenin had decided he ought to mean in the case at hand. This is not an uncommon way by which people who are very dogmatic but also quite practical and intelligent in adjusting their scruples to what they mean to do".

Furthermore, the significance of the Russian Revolution lies in the fact that it was an event sounding the death-knell of pre-history so that history could begin. According to Marx, all the previous political changes were the work of minorities and every political change led to change in the group of exploiters since in every political change a specific group of exploiters gained control of the means of production. Added to this, the whole super-structure of man as embodied in the institutions, systems, principles, values, religion, literatures, arts and science only served the ends of the economically dominant section of a society while the Have-nots were made to believe and cherish that the whole super-structure was for their own good. The whole super-structure as sustained by the Haves could be ended in the era of communism since the means of production would be owned by the whole society. Logically, in such a society the values, principles, systems, institutions and everything could genuinely serve the ends of all people instead of a few. Since such would be the total transformation of society, Marx contended that pre-history would end with the withering away of the proletariat dictatorship and history would begin, that is, the story of man before civilization would come to an end and true

civilization would begin. In brief, what the revolution signifies is the promise of a new Garden of Eden.

Additional Note

In the end we have to concede that socialism can be realized has been made feasible only by the success of the Russian Revolution. Russian achievements in the economic activity as piloted by the Plans has captivated the imagination of a great number of nations in the world. Today there are more than hundred countries which have planning as the means and socialism as the goal. The very existence of Soviet Russia is a constant challenge for the capitalist society. In other words, the importance of the Russian Revolution lies in the fact that the capitalist societies have to continue fighting their own creation since socialism, or Marxism is a direct product of the capitalist system. Today's challenge is the one between an aged order and a youthful order promising to usher better times for mankind. Whether the Soviet system at the moment would be replaced by a different order or not, is a hypothetical question. Even if the

socialist society of the world were to come to an end, the idea of socialism meaning equitable distribution of wealth and a better and fair deal for the humblest in society cannot be bottled up. After all, Socialism is no enigma and is no monster since it is a logical consummation of the democratic tradition. The champions and martyrs of democracy nearly succeeded in giving man various political freedoms like freedom of speech, expression, religion, association, and what not. After receiving these freedoms the Have-nots have started asking for food, clothing, shelter and security. Thus, as socialism is a logical extension of democratic tradition, it cannot be wished away whether there is Soviet Russia or not. In brief, the Russian Revolution is a monumental landmark in the emancipation of man.

HISTORY OF RUSSIA

Russia was not accepted as a member of the European family of nations till 1945. On three counts, Russia was treated as a parvenu by the European monarchs, diplomats and statesmen: Russians belonged to the Slavic race unlike the other Europeans; they belonged to the Greek Orthodox Church while Rome was the centre for the other Europeans; and the Russian language was quite different from other European languages.

In order to break loose from the barriers of this European untouchability the founder of Czarist modern Russia, Peter the Great, worked in the dockyards of London, while he was the crown prince, hoping that he would modernize Russia after ascending the throne. As the Czar of Russia he even went to the extent of asking his courtiers to shave off their beards so that they could look like other Europeans. He ventured on the strategy of warm-water outlets for Russia so that the country could become one of the European family of nations. He succeeded partly after he defeated Sweden, and that was how Petrograd (today's Leningrad) came into existence. Later, Catherine the Great made an unsuccessful bid to enter the Mediterranean through the Balkans and the Black Sea. Although she did not succeed in securing the second warm-water outlet, she went in for cosmetic treatment like purchasing the art treasures of Europe and inviting the intellectuals of Europe, particularly those of France, to her court.

As Russia went ahead to make herself acceptable to the European family of nations, she also was infected by the desire to expand her territories just as the other European nations. The desire of Russia for furs made her expand into Siberia leading her ultimately to the

penalties were imposed. Siberia was converted into a prison-house.

Moreover Alexander III vigorously pursued the policy of Russification. The cultural life of Russians was imposed on every minority. The subject people were forced to abandon their distinctive national traditions and become good Russians obeying the Czar, speaking the Russian language, and adhering to the Russian faith. In Poland, Ukraine and the Baltic provinces the subject peoples of Russia suffered the most.

One more facet of the Russification policy of Alexander III was the persecution of the Jews. Series of repressive measures were taken against them; forbidden to acquire land, kept out of liberal professions, and all Jews made to emigrate to the western provinces. Many government officials taking the cue from the Czar organised anti-Jewish riots called Pogroms, attended by plunder, arson, and in some instances, massacre.

Although Alexander III concentrated on consolidating his hold over the peoples of his empire, he did not abandon expansionist designs. He pushed forward the conquest of Turkistan and laid the foundation of Russian supremacy in Persia. He also entered into an alliance with France hoping that it would enable him to face the challenge of Great Britain for the dominance of Asia and for checking the Teutonic pretensions in Europe.

Matters did not change during the days of Nicholas II, who ruled from 1894 to 1917. He was a weak man inclined to fatalism and mysticism, but with a streak of petty obstinacy. He retained the whole repressive apparatus of his father. He had some pretensions too. He thought himself to be an avenger of the Slaves throughout the world and a promoter of the world's peace.

All the time the industrial development that began during the time of his father picked up momentum. Industrial and commercial activity quickened in Poland and European Russia. Oil came to be exploited in the Caucasus and the areas of Black and Caspian Seas. A large number of factories came into existence in Kiev, Petersburg and Moscow, and ship-building in the ports of Riga and in Odessa, Vladivostok and Archangel. By 1904, Russia ranked as the fourth industrial country of the world.

However, the Russian empire as a whole remained pre-dominantly agricultural. In 1914, six-sevenths of its total population of 130 million was engaged in agriculture while the rest lived in urban areas.

A consequence of the growth of industries in Russia was the increase in the size of the middle class along with the urban proletariat. It was from these two sections of society that opposition came to the autocratic government. The leading men of Czarist Russia were divided over the industrialisation of Czarist Russia. Plehve and the Slavophile enthusiasts regarded the development of industrialization and urbanism as a positive danger to autocracy and the rural aristocracy. On the other hand, Count Witte, a Russian industrialist, as well as Russian patriots welcomed the developments, Count Witte, while remaining a political Conservative, advocated commercial and industrial development. Under his guidance, a railway network and a banking network came into existence.

Taking advantage of the new circumstances, the opposition that was dormant to the Czarist regime gradually raised its head. Strangely a number of ultra-conservative landowners and peasants supported the growing opposition. They had no thought of revolution but they were annoyed by the disproportionate emphasis laid on industry and

commerce. A large number of them protested against Witte's economic policies and the political system that sanctioned it. Nicholas II was forced to dismiss the finance minister, Witte. The landed classes felt happy. But the liberal element in society was strengthened by the Czar's apparent determination to retain most of Witte's policies.

Added to this, the growing bourgeoisie came to believe that their good depended on the dilution of autocracy and the establishment of constitutional government where they could have a say. This thinking increased the influence of liberal and westernizing intellectuals. They organized themselves into a liberal party in 1904 known as the Union of Liberators.

The situation was further aggravated by unrest among peasants and the emergence of extreme revolutionary movements amongst the urban proletariat. A number of secret societies consisting of extremely radical intellectuals, workers and peasants came into existence. They developed a penchant of conspiring against the government, assassinating officials and suffering martyrdom. Far more significant was the penetration of the gospel of Karl Marx. The Social Democratic Party founded in 1898 swore by Marxian socialism. The Socialist Revolutionary Party founded in 1900 tried to modify Marxian socialism to suit the traditional communal life of Russian peasants - advocated socialization of the land and its distribution among those who actually tilled it. The social revolutionaries were as powerful as the social democrats. In 1903 the Social Democratic Party broke up into two parties because of differences over tactics. The left wing majority party came to be known as Bolsheviks, while the right wing minority party as the Mensheviks.

More discontent was added by the growing opposition of subject peoples. The Poles, Jews, Finns and other subject peoples were prepared to cooperate with any Russian group that promised relief from the cruel Russification programme. Thus, there were many signs, at the beginning of the 20th century, not only of a renewal of foreign aggression by Russia but also of a revolutionary outbreak within Russia.

SECTION II.

Desiring to contain Russia within its limits, Britain concluded a treaty with Japan in 1902. By then, Japan had decided on a course of expansionism. Since Russian interests in Manchuria and Korea stood in the way of their expansionist policy, Japan went to war with Russia in 1904. To the surprise of everyone, Japan won spectacular victories. Russian armies were driven from the Korean border and north of Port Arthur. Russian fleets were totally destroyed. At the battle of Mukden in Manchuria the Russian army was defeated. This total discomfiture of Russia against a little known Asian State emboldened the critics or revolutionaries within Czarist Russia. The whole blame was put on Czarist autocracy which was propped up by corrupt officials and incompetent generals. Most of all, Russian national honour was stained.

In July 1904, Plehve, the most unscrupulous general of the autocratic regime, was blown into pieces by a bomb. Prominent members of local Zemstvos and municipal Dumas petitioned the Czar to reform the political system by guaranteeing enough liberties, extending local self-government and instituting a national parliament.

The Czar turned a deaf ear. Instead, he appointed General Trepov to head the police. The middle-class

liberals while praising the new political system of Europe delivered provocative speeches against the prevailing system at home. Workers staged political strikes in Moscow, Vilna and other industrial centres. A procession of strikers headed by the orthodox priest, Gapon, was fired upon by troops while it was on its way to present a petition to the Czar. The bloodshed of January 22, 1905 earned the title of Red Sunday. In rural areas bands of peasants wandered under socialist revolutionary leaders looting and burning mansions of nobles and landlords. The uncle of the Czar, the Great Duke Sergei was assassinated in Moscow.

Perturbed by the events, the Czar made some flattering concessions. Promised religious toleration. Permitted the use of Polish in private schools. Relaxed the enforcement of anti-Jewish legislation. To please the peasants he remitted the arrears owned by them for their share in the communal lands. To placate the liberals he promised a constitutional government. As rioting continued, he even announced that a parliament would be instituted to advise the government in making laws. Some of the ruthless advisers of the Czar were dropped and Count Witte was made premier. The October Manifesto guaranteed personal liberties and conceded a moderate popular franchise for the election of parliament. In the meantime a general strike in Finland broke out to free the country from the Czarist control. The Czar conceded their demand.

But from 1906 onwards the revolutionary wave began to recede. The army that returned from the East was used for the restoration of order at home. Many Russians began to long for peace since the rioting went on for two years. Worse was the dissipation of the energies of the revolutionaries in factional quarrels. A radical group of liberals demanded that the first parliament or Duma should act as a constitutional convention to

prepare a constitution and the Czar should be only a figure-head. Another group of people known as Octoberists, consisting of conservative liberals, did not want to go beyond the October Manifesto.

Consequently, the reactionary elements closed their ranks and prepared to do battle for the preservation of autocracy. They organized themselves into the Union of the Russian people. Their followers known as Black Bands or Black Hundreds, started reactionary terrorism and also incited mob violence against the Jews. They pressurized the Czar to withdraw the concessions that he had made in 1906. The Czar retracted his earlier steps and dismissed Count Witte. The new Minister of Interior, Peter Stolypin, came down heavily on the revolutionary agitations. He even dissolved the Duma. In the second Duma that met in 1907 the revolutionaries once again obtained majority. So the second Duma was dissolved. The Czar issued a law stating the future Dumas could not oppose the government. To achieve this objective the suffrage was restricted. Understandably, the third Duma or October 1907 was made up of conservatives and Octoberists. Outside the Duma the revolutionaries and the disaffected subject nationalities persevered in their opposition.

From 1907 to 1914 the Russian government slipped back into its old grooves. The third Duma passed some moderate land reforms and a scheme of workmen's insurance was adopted. The government in reality led while the Duma followed. Indeed Stolypin was murdered by a Jewish lawyer in 1911, but the regime continued its own ruthless oppression.

In the same period the reactionary statesmen of Russia, wanting to restore the country's international prestige, came to an understanding with Britain in 1907. This understanding supplemented the France-Russian Dual

Alliance making it into the Triple Entente. Emboldened by this moral support, Russia started pursuing a vigorous policy in the Balkans. They also started modernizing the army and the navy.

Since Russia was a member of the Triple Entente and was eager to make herself felt in the Balkans, she was drawn into the war of 1914 opposing Germany, Austria-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire. Russia suffered terrible military reverses in 1915. The Tsarina managed the government from Petrograd but she blindly followed the whims of Rasputin, a confidante of hers, in filling offices and deciding policies. The Czar was at the front and felt increasingly helpless to direct his troops. In December 1916 a group of noblemen got Rasputin poisoned. In winter of 1916-17 popular disaffection spread all over Russia. Patriots complained that the government was hampering vigorous prosecution of the war. Subject nationalities grew restless. Peasants went on riot while the workers organized strikes.

And on 11th March 1917, the government decreed that the Petrograd strikers should return to work and that the recently reassembled Duma should go back home. The strikers refused to obey the order. The soldiers went over to the strikers. Thus was formed the Revolutionary Soviet of Soldiers and Workmen. Surprisingly, the Duma also refused to obey. And it sent a telegram to the Czar imploring him to name a new and liberal ministry. On the 15th March, a deputation of the Duma waited on the Czar to convince him that he must abdicate. He abdicated in favour of his brother, Michael. Since the situation was already uncontrollable, Michael declined to assume the crown.

Then the Duma and the Petrograd Soviet came to an agreement to establish a provisional government under the chairmanship of Prince George Lvov, a liberal

landlord. This government at once proclaimed freedom of association, press and religion. It liberated thousands of political prisoners and lifted the ban on political exiles. Restored full autonomy to Finland. Promised autonomy to Poland. It announced to summon a National Constituent Assembly elected by universal manhood suffrage.

At the same time the government wanted to vigorously pursue the war. The allies were on the offensive. The Russian armies could not fight. Peasants, who mostly constituted the army, were ill-equipped. Defeatism spread rapidly and most alarmingly in Russia. Russian soldiers were more concerned with getting something for themselves from the Provisional Government at home than with waging a foreign war. In May 1917, the conservative Prince George Lvoy resigned and was succeeded by a radical, Alexander Kerensky.

There was no agreement at home on a generally acceptable programme of internal reforms or on how to resist the rapidly spreading Soviets of soldiers, workers and peasants. The Bolsheviks or Communists were astutely led by Lenin, who had returned from exile in Switzerland. Leon Trotsky, who had returned from America, preached that the revolution should not make any compromise with capitalism or the bourgeoisie. Lenin and Trotsky acquired a great influence over the Petrograd Soviet and over other Soviets. The peasants in the army at the front were also won over although they were hazy about the economic philosophy of the Communists. This readiness on the part of Russian soldiers to desert was further quickened by the propaganda which German agents spread along the eastern front.

In vain Kerensky begged the allies to agree to a peace without annexation or indemnities. In vain he struggled to restore the discipline of the faltering

Russian armies. In July 1917 he desperately launched an offensive against the Austrians and the Germans. But the Russian troops mutinied. Disappointed like this, Kerensky schemed to establish a military dictatorship. Unfortunately, Kerensky and the army chief could not agree upon dictatorship, although neither of them was sufficiently daring enough to strike. Now Kerensky turned to the left and promised speedy reforms within Russia.

In November 1917, a second revolution occurred in Russia. Kerensky's provisional government was overthrown. Lenin as the head of the Communists took charge of affairs.

When Lenin captured power in November 1917, his followers were small in number but his programme was well tailored to enlist wide popular support. He claimed that his dictatorship was the dictatorship of the proletariat including peasants and soldiers along with workers. For each of them he proposed immediate benefits. He decreed confiscation of private factories to please the industrial workers. He decreed appropriation of the land of landlords to attract the peasants. He took Russia out of the World War to please the war-weary soldiers. In November he issued a declaration of the rights of people recognizing the principle of cultural nationalism while promising a measure of self-determination for the subject peoples.

This programme of action was given extensive publicity through the numerous Soviets which came up throughout Russia during 1917. Indeed there was a good deal of opposition, not only from the supporters of Czardom but also constitutional democrats or cadets of radical parties like Social Revolutionaries and Menshevik Socialists. As a matter of fact, three-fourths of the seats in the Constituent Assembly prior to Lenin's seizure of power were captured by anti-Bolsheviks.

When it met in January 1918, Lenin denounced it as an agency of reaction while soldiers broke it up. The Communist Soviets throughout the country, although small in number, terrorized the majority. Ruthless action was taken against recalcitrant nobles and capitalists and against army officers and bureaucrats of the old regime. Those who could not flee were put to death. The Orthodox Church in Russia was dis-established in 1918 in order to silence all Christian clergymen. By an order of the local Soviet, Czar Nicholas II, his wife and children were slaughtered near the Urals in July 1918. Against every dissident political group, communist soldiers and revolutionary tribunals established a reign of terror. A considerable part of the opposition was frightened into passivity. Tens of thousands were killed and other thousands escaped death by fleeing from the country.

This terrorism was further aggravated because of foreign intervention. Germany interfered in March 1918 to strengthen their own military position as well as prevent the spread of communism to central Europe. They forced the Bolshevik government to make a promise that they would not support subversive propaganda in central Europe. Germany also encouraged leaders of the liberated border countries, including Ukraine to set up national governments allied with Germany. But after the collapse of Germany in November, 1918, the pressure on Russian Communists was lessened.

By then, however, the allies were already intervening. Statesmen and leading men of France, Britain, Japan and the U.S. were outraged by Lenin's dictatorship for withdrawing from the war, for making a separate peace, for repudiating Russia's foreign debts, and for preaching a worldwide communist revolution. Active allied intervention began in March, 1918 as a war measure against Germany. Refusing

to recognize the government, which concluded the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk with Germany, the allies enforced an economic blockade of Russia. Further, they landed expeditionary forces at Murmansk on the Arctic Ocean, at Vladivostok in Eastern Siberia, and Odessa in the Black Sea. Encouraged by the presence of foreign troops, various Russian generals collected themselves as the White Armies. Civil war broke out between the Red and White Armies.

Towards the close of 1918 and all through 1919 it seemed Lenin's government would collapse. Allied troops assisted by the White Armies, captured Archangel in the north, occupied the Crimean peninsula in the south, and overran the greater part of Siberia from the East. General Denikin advanced in the direction of Moscow from Crimea. At Omsk, in Western Siberia, a Constituent Assembly was set up as the legal successor to Kerensky's government. It received the support of the forces under the command of the American Admiral Kolchak.

What did the foreign intervention mean? The capitalist world was scared of communism. Almost like new crusaders they swarmed to support the anti-revolutionist groups. Since Soviet Russia came to be paralysed at its very birth, the Soviet government increased its repression. Who would not like to survive? Each nation at no time in history had abjectly surrendered without giving a fight. Apart from this basic consideration in the fight that was put up by Soviet Russia, the new leaders firmly believed that they were fighting for a holy cause. There is a basic similarity between the religions of the world and communism. Every religion sought to improve the lot of the most poor and the most humble. Marx, too, sought to save the same kind of people. But there is one difference here. The religious leaders were visionaries and idealists

and they mostly promised better things to come after life. On the contrary, the approach of Marx is scientific and (inferences are drawn from empirical data) he promised a new age now itself. Such being the basic similarity between the religions of the world and communism, those who became Marxists or Marxist-Leninists showed the same faith and fervour of any devout follower of any religion. In brief, apart from fighting for survival, the Soviet government fought for the vindication and triumph of a new faith.

Gradually the Bolsheviks or Communists were able to stem the rot. The opposing armies were disabled by the personal rivalries of the generals. The followers of various non-communist parties chronically disputed over what should replace Bolshevism; on the other hand, the Bolsheviks had no dissenters within. With a singleness of purpose bordering on ruthless fanaticism, aided by an adroit popular propaganda and an adept military organization, they soon outwitted everyone.

Trotsky, as Lenin's commissar of war, proved the man of the hour. He inflamed the Russian masses of peasants and workers with hatred for the Whites. Though the Red soldiers were often in rags and poorly armed, they were far more enthusiastic than their enemy and by the end of 1919 they were far more numerous in numbers.

Further, the foreign powers were in no position to conduct extensive military operations in Russia. Germany was impotent. France was more eager to penalise Germany than willing to undertake an expensive forceful debt collection in Russia. Great Britain had to face multiplicity of other imperial problems and growing pacifism at home. Japan was more interested in making gains in China than in

overthrowing a government in far-away Europe. By 1920 the foreign armies were withdrawn. Soon the anti-Communist rebellions in Russia collapsed. Indeed France sought to incite the people on the Russian borders to fight the Communists attack by Poland and the insurrection in Ukrain in 1920. But the Red Armies of Communist Russia defeated the Poles and drove them back to the very gates of Warsaw. Russian troops suffered a defeat but the Poles were not confident of victory. They concluded a treaty in 1921.

By 1921 the authority of Communist dictatorship was not seriously disputed in Russia. Germany formally recognized the dictatorship in 1922. Great Britain, France and Italy recognized the Soviet regime in 1924 and the U.S.A. in 1934. But the Soviet attempts to spread revolution abroad met with failure. The revolts inspired by Russia in Germany and Hungary in 1919 were quickly crushed. Russia did, however, manage to depach Outer Mongolia from China and set up a puppet Communist government there in 1924.

In the meantime, the Soviet regime was made to part with certain European territories by a series of treaties during 1921-22. The independence of Finland, Estonia, Luthuania and Poland was recognised. Romania's annexation of Bessarabia was overlooked. In a way, the Soviet government adopted a pacific policy in its foreign relations. It renounced the spheres of influence and special privileges which the Czar's government earlier obtained in Turkey, Persia and China.

Within Russia the principle of nationality was conceded transforming the old empire into a federal union of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. At first it comprised of four states and by 1937 it became eleven. Out of these,

Russia proper, Ukrain, Byelorussia were wholly or largely European. Eight States are Asian. Out of all the States the Russian State is by far the largest and most important: it contains nearly two-thirds of the population and three-fourths of the total area.

Section III

To govern the country the Communists adopted a Constitution in 1918 which was revised and expanded in 1923, in 1936 and in 1977. Formally these constitutions are democratic. In reality the Communist Party exercises supreme power. No political party other than the Communist party can exist in USSR. Every person in the Communist Party must have an unquestioning faith in the principles of Marx and Lenin. It is the only party that could put up candidates for government offices.

Further, it had an extraordinary tribunal called the Cheka for summary trials and executions of its opponents. Prior to 1922, 50,000 persons were put to death. It was revived in 1923 under the initials of DGPU. It enjoyed the power to arbitrarily seize, imprison, exile or sentence to death any person suspected of counter-revolutionary tendencies in politics or economics. "Shooting is the highest measure of social defence".

At the apex of the party organization was the dictator. The first dictator was Lenin. He held the two posts of the President of the Council of Commissars in the government and President of the Politburo in the Party. By 1922 Lenin was partially paralysed. It led to bitter rivalry between Trotsky and Stalin. Since Stalin gained control of the party, he became the Dictator shortly after Lenin's death in 1924. Trotsky was dismissed

...../.

from the Commissariat of War, expelled from the party, and ultimately forced to flee abroad.

The avowed central purpose of the communist dictatorship is to realise in Russia the material and economic millennium promised to the toiling masses by Marx. Capitalism should be destroyed and the profit-making motive should be eliminated.

In order to achieve this goal a variety of expedients were tried. According to war communism decreed in 1918, private property was confiscated. Factories and land were socialised. Debts, both domestic and foreign, were repudiated. The government financed the industries frequently in kind and the industries delivered their production to the State to be distributed to other industries, to the countryside, and to the army. This war communism did not work well as it led to a catastrophic decline in production and consumption. Industrial production dropped in 1920 to 12 percent of its pre-war level. Net output of coal fell to zero in 1921. Agricultural production declined by a third. Forty million persons suffered from malnutrition and at least five million starved to death. Millions more would have died but for the arrival of foreign relief.

Realizing the colossal failure of war communism, Lenin substituted a new economic policy called NEP in the spring of 1921. Peasants were permitted to trade for profit in the open market after handing over a specific percentage of the produce to the government. Private industry was also permitted, but socialization was retained for banking, transport and some large manufacturing establishments.

Matters improved. In 1927 the gross industrial production regained the level of 1913 although production

of iron ore and foodgrains was below the 1913 level.

Something more was required to be done. Protracted and bitter debates were held in the Communist Party. After Stalin was established as Lenin's successor, he imposed a system of bureaucratic state socialism involving forced advance of industrialisation and collective farming through a series of five-year plans. During the first five-year plan from 1928 to 1933, industrial production virtually doubled. New industries came to be set up. Supply of electric power was trebled. Agriculture was mechanized but the total agricultural production did not go up much.

While the country grappled with massive economic problems, the Soviet government used mass propaganda as the prime means to strengthen the dictatorship. Dissident political groups were dissolved. Newspapers printed only the approved Communist opinions. Universities and learned societies were purged of scholars unsympathetic to dictatorship.

Against religion also rigorous measures were taken up. In January 1918, the Church and the State were separated. The property of the Church was confiscated and all Church schools were closed. The Orthodox Church and all the other Christian bodies were reduced to the status of private cults. Many clergymen were exiled or put to death. Public teaching of religion was forbidden.

On the other hand, the government actively encouraged atheistic propaganda. A militant Society of the Godless came into existence. It established permanent exhibitions of anti-religious paintings and cartoons, held frequent demonstrations, and conducted systematic campaign of vituperation against priests and of jeering at religious rites and beliefs.

And communism itself became a kind of religion. It promised a millennium. Not since the Jacobinism of the French Revolution had there been an all-compelling religion as the Russian Communism. In the Red Square of Moscow was enshrined in 1924 the embalmed body of Lenin as an object of public worship. In workmen's tenements and peasants' cottages lithographs of Lenin and Marx and Stalin were hanged, like icons in the midst of customary candles. The religion of communism was formal, but it was also very serious and very intolerant.

In furtherance of its aims, the dictatorship permitted popular education. Schools multiplied, but always under strict government control. By 1940 Soviet Russia became literate. The population can now read as well as hear communist propaganda.

Another agency of communist propaganda was the Red Army. After the defeat of the White Armies the earlier Red Army was gradually demobilized. From 1925 onwards, a permanent Red Army based on modern methods came into existence. In 1935 about three-fourths of the officers were members of the Communist Party or of its affiliate, the League of Youth.

CAUSES OF RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

Finding causes in social sciences is a very poor imitation of causal relations in positive and to some extent in natural sciences. Whenever we establish a causation in positive sciences it is established that one material fact inevitably leads to another material fact, as for example, water boiling at 100 degree temperature, provided the air pressure is at sea level. To establish such causation even with a qualification is an impossibility in social sciences including history. The greatest impediment in establishing such causation is the absence of any law of uniformity governing the material factors involved in any social situation. Since no two human beings or no two communities are the same, it is impossible to establish precise causal relations leading to social events or situations. On the other hand, in positive and natural sciences all the material facts that are tested in a laboratory are the same all over the world, as for example, one gram of copper sulphate is the same either in Delhi or Timbaktu.

Faced with this predicament when we are asked to find out the causes of the Russian Revolution, we can identify the material factors that had gone into the making of the French Revolution -- some as exotic as the ingredients that go into the witch's broth in Macbeth -- but we cannot pin down the one cause that led to the revolution.

Although handicapped in identifying the causes that led to the Russian Revolution in 1917 we can venture to state that there are certain primary causes apart from the secondary. And within the primary cause a few played a crucial role although Marxists tend to emphasise the age or environment to be the most important than the individuals associated with any historical event.

Secondary causes

(1) Growth of industrial workers -- caused by industrialization from the mid-19th century -- also facilitated by the influx of peasants from rural Russia and foreign investments.

(2) The condition of the proletariat was miserable. By the close of the 19th Century, 12-hour day was common while the living conditions of the workers were as bad as the workers in 18th-century England.

(3) Dissatisfaction of peasants because of poor living conditions, natural calamities and the refusal of the Czarist government to aid them -- also for a long time the petty tyrannies of the landed aristocrats -- much worse was the suffering of the peasant recruits in the army, particularly during the First World War.

(4) Growth of urban areas and urban population along with the spread of liberal ideas during the 19th century.

(5) National prestige wounded by series of defeats suffered by Russia in the 19th Century and in particular at the hand of the Japanese in 1905.

(6) Authoritarianism and repressive policies of Alexander III against every section of society except for a few courtiers, aristocrats and hangers-on.

(7) Continuation of the same repressive policies by Nicholas II and the retracting on the promises that were made during the revolt of 1905. The merciless firing on the unarmed procession led by Gapon left an indelible imprint on the Russian people, particularly the very humble in society.

(8) The foolishness and the intrigues of the Czarina and her favourite Rasputin.

(9) The inability of the governments after the abdication of Nicholas II to stem the rot.

Primary Causes

■ (1) It is impossible to stem the new order (nationalism, liberalism and even socialism) that was sweeping through Europe in the 19th Century.

■ (2) The leadership of Lenin and the well-organized Bolshevik party. Starting from the overthrow of Kerensky's government, Lenin took correct steps every time to see through the revolution. Trotsky was indeed brilliant in organizing the armed forces against the White Russians as well as the foreign intruders. Lenin's greatness consists not only in taking correct steps in every military move but also in changing the policy of war communism. Lenin deliberately opted for the new Economic Policy while conceding the fact that the earlier policy was a failure. Supported by well disciplined Bolshevik party he kept the control of all what was happening in Russia all through the period of the revolutionary movement disciplined soldiers making correct tactical moves without losing sight of strategy (Trotsky lived in a train till 1921 but everyday he received instructions from Lenin through telephone), the counter revolutionaries and traitors were ruthlessly dealt with by Cheka and DGPU. Lenin himself informed of what was happening in the economic situation, and made enormous sacrifices in foreign relations by surrendering territory, promising better treatment to subject nationalities, and so on. Lenin was a practical genius apart from being a brilliant theoretician of Marxism. After his death there was nothing but to consolidate what he had achieved. However small the stature

...../.

of Stalin in comparison to Lenin, he succeeded in consolidating the revolution of Lenin and also leading the country to victory in the Second World War when Hitler deployed 250 Panzer divisions against Soviet Russia while the Allies faced only 50 Panzer divisions.

■ (3) (a) There was something very significant about the intellectual climate of Soviet Russia in the 19th and the early 20th Century. The ideas of modernity slowly spread in Czarist Russia. Interestingly Freemasonry was the first to be felt by Russians as early as 1771: a secret society aiming to spread deism.

(b) A wave of realism was ushered in Russia by Tolstoi, Chekhov, and Gorky. Tolstoi in his later novels grew more philosophical and revolutionary renouncing all private property while extolling a kind of communist and anarchist Christianity. Chekhov concentrated on peasant life and extolled simple but tragic life. Gorky in his later writings mostly wrote on social problems primarily discursive and in an increasingly revolutionary style. The school of realism to which they belonged primarily stressed on how an individual responds to his domestic and social milieu and to traditional and institutional ethics. Alongwith it all the writers of realism pleaded on behalf of radical social reforms like uplifting of labour classes, emancipating women, ending social ills and war, and redistribution of wealth.

(c) The really unique feature of Russian writers was the theme of eternal human emotion and problems and a concern for the welfare of people. It differed from the more militant nationalistic culture such as the German. The great sons and lovers of Russia did not yearn for national unity and independence (which they already had).

but for greater human happiness and peace of mind, and a less oppressive social order. Nationalism in Russia was a rebellion against fate and the elements, and against history and the harshness of life itself. What they represented was a culture of struggles of the human heart and problems of the soul and a culture of revolt even more than that of nationality. The same unique quality was reflected in the symphonies of Borodin and Tychovsky, the programme in music of Rimsky - Korsakov, the songs of Musorgski. All of them leaned heavily on legends and folk tales of Russia for their themes.

(d) Such being the unique nature of the intellectual ferment in Russia it naturally generated a passion amongst the people for fairness and justice. The intelligentsia of the day included some of the nobles, part of the urban population engaged in trade and professions, and the majority of the university students and graduates. Impelled by the new monumental human passion, unique to Russia alone, the intelligentsia gave such a dynamism to radicalism and revolutionary movements that when the Czarist State and the old order collapsed they came down with a thunderclap.

Out of these three primary causes, the most important was the Bolshevik leadership under Lenin which turned the intellectual climate of the day for their own advantage. Although all the three leaders - Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin - were often in exile, they exploited every folly and blunder of the Czarist regime as well as their other opponents' to their own advantage.

NAZISM

CHRONOLOGY OF GERMAN MILITARISM

By 1929 the German Republic appeared to be stable. The Dawes Plan and Young Plan reduced the burden of reparations, while business witnessed marked revival. Germany signed the Locarno pact to prevent another war with France. She was admitted as a great power to the League of Nations. In the general elections of 1928, the Republicans polled almost 28 million votes out of a total of 31 million. But the whole stability was shaken up by the economic crisis of 1929.

The earlier prosperity was somewhat artificial since it was raised on liberal foreign loans and financial speculation. The depression ended the foreign loans while the allies took time to lighten the burden of reparations which she had yet to fulfil. Internal economies swelled unemployment. Heavier taxation impeded the recovery of business.

Seeing the setbacks of the Republicans the Communist Party made gains. But the principal beneficiary was the Nazi party which redoubled its propaganda and its violence.

Chancellor Bruning could not take effective measures. He called for elections in 1930. The Communists gained over a million votes, and the Nazis almost six million.

Taking cognizance of the inability of Bruning to restore stability, president Hinderburg gradually moved away from the Republicans. He was outraged with the proposal of Bruning to break up the large landed estates of his native East Prussia. He promptly dismissed Bruning in 1932 and appointed Von Papen, an aristocrat, as the Chancellor. The Socialists, Communists and the Centrists were hostile to Von Papen and this made him

rely on the backing of Hitler and the National Socialists. Since Papen was a conservative, he removed all the socialists from the State governments.

A general election was held in August 1932. Papen's party lost seats. But matters could not be settled easily. After a couple of stop-gap ministries, President Hindenburg was compelled to summon Hitler to form the government in January 1933.

Hindenburg after appointing Hitler as the Chancellor, declared "And now, Gentlemen, forward with God". It was really forward for Hitler. "What! That man!" said Hindenburg in 1932, when he was asked to consider Hitler for Chancellor's post: "I will make him a postmaster; and he can lick stamps with my head on them." What a change in 1933.

Backed by the conservative nationals, the Nazis rapidly spread their control. They commanded the public, the police, as well as the private strong troops. When Reichstag caught fire, the blame was put on the communists.

Amidst excitement and terrorism new elections were held in March 1933. The National Socialists secured remarkable victory. The senile Hindenburg decreed that the Republican Flag of black, red and gold should be hauled down and replaced by two flags -- the black, white and red of the old empire and the Swastika of Hitler. In April, the Reichstag delegated all powers to Hitler for four years. Thus the German Republic formally passed away and the third German Empire succeeded, which was essentially the Nazi dictatorship.

Hitler went ahead with his design of suppressing all the internal opponents: communists, militant labour, Jews and everyone who opposed Nazism. The Nationalist party which supported Hitler earlier realised that it was but the tail of the Nazi dog. By a government

decree all the other parties were banned. Within six months Hitler became a virtual dictator. The several State governments, the entire civil and military bureaucracy, the press, the radio, the schools and all individual liberties were subordinated to Hitler.

In order to seek national endorsement, Hitler chose ^{international issues from now onwards.} ~~Conference of the League of Nations~~, Hitler's ^{disarmament} representative claimed the right of Germany to re-arm unless the other powers immediately reduced their armaments to the German level. The Conference could not decide. Hitler withdrew from the conference and announced Germany's withdrawal from the League. It was this particular issue that was presented before the German electorate. A plebiscite overwhelmingly supported Hitler's decision to withdraw from the League. For the elections of the Reichstag nearly 40 million votes were cast to the National Socialist Party while 3½ million ballots were either blank or damaged.

In 1933 the rise of Hitler synchronized with Japan's withdrawal from the League of Nations and German aggression in Europe was followed by Japanese aggression in Asia. Before the German aggression began, various steps were taken by Hitler as preparatory measures.

Hitler went ahead to tighten his party organization and also purge all dubious elements. Within a month after this purge, President Hindenburg died. At the funeral of the President, Hitler, as the chief mourner and orator, decreed that he should be President as well the Chancellor under the new official title of Imperial leader. The plebiscite of August 1934 ratified the decree.

Hitler further strengthened his position within the country through his henchmen and through extensive propaganda. Assisted by Goering, armament industries were started which provided full employment for German workmen and a satisfactory profits for industrialists. The Minister of Economy by a complicated system of currency controls and barter deals, secured raw material for its rearmament without overtaxing his people and while at the same time extending German economic and political influence in central Europe, the Balkans and south America by 1935.

Hitler made friendly overtures to Great Britain and to Poland. The latter signed a non-aggression pact with Germany in 1934 which guaranteed Poland's territorial integrity for 10 years. Poland was fooled but Hitler knew that he was only weaning away an ally of France for his future plans of annexation of Austria and re-arming Germany. Although the Versailles Treaty prohibited Austrian union with Germany, Hitler connived at a coup in July 1934 but it failed. France and Italy adversely reacted and concluded a pact in 1935. Just at that time a plebiscite was held in Saar and it went overwhelmingly in favour of Germany. The territory was returned to the Nazis.

Elated by this success, Nazi

Germany went ahead to provoke disturbances in other areas, preparatory for their annexation -- Denzing, Memel, Sudetanland, etc.

In March 1935, Hitler dramatically announced repudiation of all treaty limitations and Germany's re-armament and the re-establishment of universal conscription. The people at home applauded but France and Great Britain had their own reservations. France and Russia signed a treaty of mutual assistance and this extended to Czechoslovakia also. It appeared

that the ambitions of Nazi Germany would be contained.

Things proved to be otherwise. Britain fearing that France might enhance its position by its alliance with Italy and Soviet Union, unilaterally sanctioned Germany's repudiation of the naval clauses in the Treaty of Versailles in return for a pledge that the German navy should not exceed 35 per cent of the British.

But in 1936 another opportunity came to Hitler in the form of Italian aggression on Ethiopia. Italy withdrew from the League. The League publicly confessed its impotence by cancelling the economic sanctions against Italy. Italy bitterly resented the opposition of France and Britain for its aggressive designs.

As the Italian-Ethiopian war was reaching its climax, Hitler ordered German troops to march into the demilitarized zones of the Rhineland as provided by the Treaty of Versailles and guaranteed by the Locarno Pact. No nation protested. Only France made the League of Nations adopt a resolution against Germany. Belgium ended its military alliance with France in 1936 and proclaimed its neutrality.

In October 1936 Fascist Italy entered into an alliance with Nazi Germany called the Rome-Berlin Axis. Next month Germany concluded a pact with Japan expressly directed against Russian communism. This anti-Comintern pact was joined by Italy in November 1937.

By then, certain developments in Spain drew the European powers into two rival blocs. Italy and Germany directly supported the cause of General Franco who ultimately came out victorious. The Republican cause was supported by Russia, while France and Britain expressed their sympathies for them. Worst of all, France and Great Britain made haste in February 1939 to conciliate General Franco by extending full diplomatic

recognition to its government. The example was soon followed by the U.S. and the other democratic powers.

In November 1936, Hitler repudiated the provisions of the Versailles Treaty regarding international control of German waterways. In January 1937 he denounced the clauses of Versailles Treaty which charged Germany with responsibility for World War I.

In the same year Japan launched its aggression against China. By the beginning of 1938 everything was shaping according to the wishes of Hitler. His armies were the strongest in the world and the best mechanized with up-to-date tanks and bombers. His people, subjected to incessant propaganda, implicitly trusted him. The Russians were sore with the western democracies for their role in the Spanish Civil War. Thus, there was no chance of the Soviet Union cooperating with the western democracies. France was troubled by internal strife. Great Britain continued to be pacific. And the United States was rigidly adhering to isolationism.

In February 1938 Hitler summoned and demanded of the Austrian Prime Minister to admit Austrian Nazis in his cabinet. The Austrian Premier hesitated and called for a plebiscite. In order to scuttle the plebiscite, Hitler despatched his troops into Austria and annexed it.

This was a flagrant case of aggression and treaty violation. None of the powers vigorously protested. Britain tried to conciliate Italy in return for Italy's promise to withdraw from Spain as soon as practicable.

Re-assured by the ineptitude of the democratic powers, Hitler rapidly prepared for aggressing against Czechoslovakia. The Czech government was willing to give autonomy for the Sudetan Germans, but Hitler

claimed outright incorporation of Sudetanland in Germany. Czechoslovakia mobilized and requested France and Russia for their promised assistance. Neville Chamberlain of Britain flew back and forth between England and Germany beseeching Hitler not to precipitate war. Despite treaty obligations, France could not go to war without Britain. A hectic conference was held in Munich in September 1938 amongst Britain, France, Italy and Germany. It authorized Germany to occupy the German regions. Another striking victory for Hitler. Chamberlain boasted 'peace in our time'. To Hitler, treaties and pacts were so many scraps of paper.

In March 1939 on the pretext of the complaints of the people, Hitler occupied Prague. In the same month Italy occupied Albania.

This alarmed both Britain and France. Hitler repeated the same game of bluff against Poland but Chamberlain arranged the Triple Alliance of Britain, France and Poland guaranteeing each other's independence and territorial integrity by war, if necessary. Russia was still undecided. But in August Russia and Germany signed the non-aggression pact - a secret protocol contained clauses relating to the partition of Poland and other things. On September 1, 1939 German armies invaded Poland and on 3rd September Great Britain and France declared war on Germany.

Germany and Russia partitioned off Poland based on the secret protocol between them. As Germany started concentrating its forces against the western allies, Russia seized the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Soviet Russia also went to war with Poland.

Since the allies were not prepared, Germany rapidly seized Denmark and Norway. On the western front,

outflanking the Maginot Line, Hitler cut through the neutral countries of Holland, Belgium and Luxemburg and later incorporated them. The British were forced to evacuate from Dunkirk. Italy, too, attacked France. German troops rapidly advanced through France. In June 1940 the Armistice was signed between France and Germany and later with Italy. A small part of France was left but the rest came under the Nazi rule.

Britain stood alone. Churchill told the Parliament that what all he could promise to his fellow countrymen was blood and toil and tears and sweat. In August 1940 a massive German air attack on British coastal towns and other towns was launched. This was the famous Battle of Britain. It continued till 1941. The German attempt to demoralize Britain failed because of the British airforce. Churchill paid a tribute to the pilots: "Never in the field of human conflict so much owed by so many to so few". Germany was not stopped. Hitler went ahead with its expansionist policies followed by Italy. Yugoslavia and Greece were occupied whereas Italians suffered reverses in Africa.

In November 1940, Germany wanted to draw close to communist Russia. Russia showed its willingness but she wanted additional pledges that she should have a free hand in Finland, Bulgaria and part of Turkey and that Japan should cede the southern half of the Sakhalin island. Enraged by the demands of Russia, Hitler went ahead with his preparations for attacking it.

In June 1941, Hitler's troops were set against Russia. German armies penetrated a thousand miles deep into the Russian territory, besieged Leningrad, reached outskirts of Moscow, and occupied the granary of Russia, Ukraine. Britain and U.S. gradually increased the quantity of their military supplies to Russia. President

Roosevelt along with Winston Churchill issued the famous Atlantic Charter. More supplies were pumped into Russia.

In the east, as the U.S. was protesting against Japanese expansionist activities, tension between the two countries grew. In December, 1941, Japan attacked the Pearl Harbour sinking a large number of American ships. The U.S., Great Britain and other minor allies declared war on Japan. The Axis associates of Japan like Germany, Italy, Romania, etc. declared war on the U.S. The Second World War became a global war.

A CRITIQUE OF NAZISM

It was a cloud-burst for a single decade. What occurred within Germany was something nightmarish. The 'formless and faceless figure' and "an epitome of the Little Man" Adolf Hitler, gifted by demonic dynamism and possessing mesmeric and mediumistic powers, swayed multitudes, rescued Germany from the despair into which she had sunk after the Treaty of Versailles, and led by his maniacal ambitions dragged the whole world into the second human cataclysm known as the Second World War.

The spectacular success and the inevitable doom of Adolf Hitler and his Nazis (shortened name for National Socialist German Workers' Party ironically) germinated in the post-Versailles conditions of Germany. The terms of the Versailles Treaty with its war guilt clauses - the military occupation of Rhineland, compulsory disarmament, territorial cessions and the burden of

reparations - caused total moral, political and psychological collapse of the German nation. The parliamentary form of government, as laid down in the Weimar Constitution, could not take roots since they had no sound constitutional tradition. The Germans were bewildered by the complexity of a party system which rapidly rose to 20 or 30 groups.

For some time Stresemann kept Germany on a sane path. By cooperating with her late enemies, in particular the U.S.A., Germany received foreign capital twice as much as she paid in reparations, which it spent on putting her industry on its feet, in secret rearmament and in expensive social welfare schemes that the victorious powers could not afford.

But with the death of Stresemann in 1929 and the economic blizzard of 1929, all hopes came to be shattered. The communists spent as much energy fighting the socialists as their opponents. The leader of the Communist Party had no wits. The Nationalist Party supported Hitler in the hope that he would serve their cause. In 1932 the Nazis became the biggest party in the German Parliament, though without a majority. President Hindenburg was made to change his sights and summon Hitler to become the Chancellor in 1933.

to believe what was happening. Confusion over the nature of the regime made it even more difficult to deal with it. Some saw Hitler simply as a nationalist leader bent, like an Ataturk, upon the regeneration of his country and the assertion of its rightful claims. Others saw him as a crusader against Bolshevism. Even the people thought he might only be a useful barrier against it, which increased the likelihood that men of the Left would see him as a tool of capitalism. But no simple formula will contain Hitler or his aims. All the while Hitler knew what he was and what he could do. At one time he claimed, "There will never again be a man with such authority, or who has the confidence of the German people as I have .. There is no time to lose .. War must come in my time."

Added to this overweening confidence, Hitler was a perfect gambler too. In November 1939 he claimed, "I am entering on a gigantic gamble. I have to choose between victory and destruction. I choose victory ... I will not survive the defeat of my people. But there will be no defeat. We shall emerge victorious. Our age will merge in the history of our people."

However boastful might be his statements, Hitler was a perverted political genius. He achieved his political ends with breathless speed. Germany left the League of Nations (October 1933), reintroduced conscription (1935) and built up a powerful military and air force, denounced the Locarno Treaty and remilitarized the Rhineland (1936), annexed Austria (March 1938) and the Sudetanland of Czechoslovakia (October 1938), seized Memel (March 1939) and even destroyed the independence of Czechoslovakia in March 1939. Hitler was gradually fulfilling the old dream which had been lost when Prussia beat Austria -- the dream of a Great Germany, defined as the lands containing those of German blood.

When Hitler brought such remarkable laurels to the discouraged, resentful and frustrated people of Germany, he struck a responsive chord in their hearts. The Germans were habituated to military and State discipline going back to the Hohenzollern's time and the days of Bismarck and Moltke and Roon. Legally, illegally, by promise, threat, or force, by hook or by crook, he got his way. The success of Hitler was in tune with the traditions of Germany. Called Fuhrer, he was treated as the embodiment of the Volkgeist - the true and the pure expression of the National Soul. Very often religious terms were used in adoration of him. He was the National Incarnation and the Collective Personality. The Fuhrer transformed the sub-conscious interest of the masses into the conscious role of the nation. The subordination of his followers was so complete that everything was attributed to him. Goering said, "The will of the Fuhrer: that is justice." Another follower of his claimed that law was that which was pronounced by Hitler. This identification of Fuhrer's will with law is in a way derived from the theory of juristic positivism familiar in Kant's and Hegel's philosophy. In a similar manner the special mission of Germany is both implicit and explicit in the thought and writings of Fichte, Nietzsche, Treitschke, Oswald, Gobineau, H.S. Chamberlain and Brucke.

Hitler had no theories and he was not ashamed of any infamy. With terrorism and violence, by demagogic frenzy and impressive showmanship, by unceasing propaganda, with an instinctive perception of human weakness and a Satanic exploitation of it, he enlarged and maintained his power. Every problem he approached in a tactical manner. Reason was a taboo with him as it might bring a reflective temper and a balanced judgement. Religion was to be crushed since it might

provide an objective standard inconvenient for his ambitions. His irrationalism was nurtured by frenzies of anti-Communism, anti-Semitism, anti-internationalism, anti-liberalism, anti-intellectualism and anti-feminism. He further bolstered the image by an arrogant reiteration of the Aryan racial supremacy and pseudo-genetics and pseudo-geopolitics.

In this incredible story a still more incredible fact was what made the German accept and follow his call. Both Gunter Grass and Heinrich Boldt, today's novelists of Germany, portray the horrors of Nazi regime in minute details, but neither of them ventures to offer an explanation except to portray a gripping and nauseating nightmare of the past. The Germans did accept it because of complex reasons. Humiliated by the Versailles Treaty and bewildered by the inflation and the confusion of the parliamentary system, people longed for leadership which would restore their self-respect and their pride. Hitler perfectly filled the bill. If he offered debased solutions, he recognized many real problems. His re-armament plans relieved unemployment. He forcibly carved out a proud place for Germany amongst the nations of Europe. He broke through the bonds of Versailles and brought home a fresh piece of victory every six months from his foreign ventures. Further, people gave their heart to Hitler because, though an Austrian, he spoke for Germany and stood up for Germany and that too stridently and fanatically giving them an orgiastic satisfaction. On the other hand, the liberals, the socialists, the democrats and other parties spoke of something that was certainly alien to them and at times even hostile to their nationalism and tradition. Placed in such a situation, the German people had condoned the dehumanization and the brutality of Hitler's regime, accepted the concentration and extermination camps,

the firing-squads, the burning of books, and the persecutions which were perhaps in any case not wholly out of accord with their own psycho-pathological emotions.

While Hitler rode on the crest of the wave of implicit popular faith, the rest of the world wore blinkers. Each of the democratic countries was caught in the post-war economic and social crisis. Worsening the situation the great depression virtually crippled the western democracies. And more important was the growth of pacificism and the fear of war-mongering, particularly in Britain. While the western democracies were passing through mighty political, social and cultural crises, as evidenced by the Wasteland of T.S. Eliot and the poetry of Stephen Spender and Auden, Hitler shot up into prominence all of a sudden. Time was too short for the western powers to realise the ogre that appeared on the horizon. In desperation the western powers took a stand by concluding a treaty with Poland in the spring of 1939 but that was too late. In Churchill's words the western powers took the stand, "at the last possible moment, on the worst possible ground. " When Hitler attacked Poland, the Polish repeated their melancholy proverb going back to the former wars: "The Poles have only two allies -- God and the French -- and both are too far away."

In the end we have to also keep in view the mighty war machine that Hitler had built up in less than a decade which he hurled against his enemies. At home the opposition found it impossible to offer resistance. The days of armed revolt by an enraged populace against the tyrant were over. The tanks, the flame-thrower, the Bren-gun, the hand grenade, changed the nature of street fighting. A highly organized system of espionage and terror and the hideous penalties of failure discouraged action on the part of dissenters.

Against foreign powers, Germany had cast aside the outdated concept of linear warfare, but based its tactics on armour, mechanization and mobility. Working as single units with wireless communication -- never attempted before -- between tank and aircraft, the armoured columns, supported by dive bombers, pierced the enemy line on narrow front at several points and then mopped up the enemy forces with the help of motor-borne infantry, which was flanked by light armour. The Germans also used magnetic mines, the first of the secret weapons which Germany made use of. The German war-machine cut through the enemy formations into ribbons and held them in pincers.

The Crooked Cross of Hitler mocking at the Christian Cross terrorized Europe for nearly a decade. What really led to this abnormal development in European history is difficult to pin-point. Multifarious factors, both objective and subjective, went into the making of Nazism. It is a blot on man's endeavours through millennia at which every man has to hang his head in shame. And no child would ever be

just as it happened with the notorious warriors of the past like Caesar, Chenghiz Khan and others -- names only fit enough for dogs. Such is the revenge of history.

JAPANJAPANESE NATIONALISM AND MILITARISM

Militarism, meaning the cult of the gun, appeared clearly with the coming of Tojo as the Prime Minister of Japan and the sensational attack on Pearl Harbour in 1941. The beginnings of modernization of Japan were embedded in certain hidden motives and one out of them was the desire of Japan to pay the West back in its own coin. In order to do so, Japan increasingly relied on the gun. To begin with, her adjoining neighbours became the victims of her aggressive imperialistic policy. In the end, in a mad outburst, it trained its guns against Uncle Sam.

Japan, too, in the beginning withdrew into her own shell just as China, when traders of Portugal, Spain and Netherlands appeared on her islands by the end of the 16th century. All foreigners were forbidden on pain of death to enter the Japanese islands. Only the Dutch were permitted to stay in a specific island.

A change came over Japan when Commodore Perry appeared with four warships in the Bay of Yeddo (Tokyo) with the request that Japanese ports should be opened to American commerce. Britain, France, the Netherlands, and Russia immediately demanded privileges. By 1860 Japan had to sign unequal treaties with all of them. The treaties provided for diplomatic representation, opening of important Japanese ports where consuls might be stationed, extra-territoriality in civil and criminal matters for foreigners, freedom of foreigners to practise their religion, a conventional tariff, and most-favoured-nation treatment in trade.

One section of people argued that the foreigners would bring machinery and other curiosities and then deceive ignorant people ending with the swallowing of Japan. The other group argued that Japan's true

policy should be to strengthen herself on her own against the West by learning their arts and sciences. The latter view prevailed.

However, the hostility the Japanese felt towards foreigners was strong. The Japanese people and certain clans held the Shogun, the de facto ruler of Japan, responsible for the unequal treaties. There was sudden outburst of loyalty for the de jure ruler, the Emperor of Japan. This opened the way for the restoration of the Meiji Emperor to full sovereign power and he ruled with dignity from 1867 to 1912. The Meiji restoration was at once a political, an economic and in some degree a social revolution of transcending importance not only to Japan but also to China and Europe.

✓ Talking of the seed time of Japanese militarism, it began immediately after the Meiji restoration in 1867 - the Shogunate was overthrown with the cry of, "Exalt the emperor and away with barbarians." This was a real revolution under the nominal leadership of Mikado. Rapid westernization began. Japan was rapidly Europeanized militarily, politically and educationally. The army was re-organised on the German pattern and the navy in accordance with the advice of the British in the seventies. Providing a base for this venture, industrialization made rapid advance. Since private capital was shy to be invested in modern industries, the Meiji government developed modern industries, particularly heavy ones, through government enterprise, i.e. under State protection. Foreign technicians were employed to teach technology. The government helped the growth of private industries through subsidy. The Japanese government laid more stress on the development of heavy-strategic military and chemical industries in order to make Japan a powerful State. They even held a national industrial exhibition. All through the period Japan imitated the West in so

Within a few months the Japanese expelled the Chinese army from Korea, defeated a Chinese fleet, captured Port Arthur and the Liaotung peninsula in South Manchuria, and seized the port of Weihai-wei on the coast of Shantung. China had to agree to Japanese terms by the Treaty of Shimonoseki which gave Japan some valuable prizes: Formosa and the Pescadores, Port Arthur and the Liaotung peninsula, the promise of a very large indemnity to meet the cost of the war and the Chinese recognition of the independence and complete autonomy of Korea.

Such a dramatic triumph of Japan alarmed the western powers of the 'Yellow Peril'. Three powers - Russia, France and Germany - compelled Japan to surrender the claim to Liaotung peninsula (including Port Arthur) which was almost immediately awarded to Russia. Japan was tricked, or rather given the strong-arm treatment. This made Japan bitter and she was not to forget this triple intervention. On their emperor's advice, however, the Japanese bore the unbearable.

But their easy victory over the Chinese gave the Japanese confidence. The Japanese learnt two lessons from the war. The use of force pays good dividends and that Japan must have allies to support her in her ambitions beyond the national frontiers. The war stabilized Japanese politics, but enhanced the prestige of the military party which steadily rose to influence with corresponding decrease in the power and control of the civilian statesmen, a development which hamstrung constitutional progress almost from the start and gave birth to authoritarian impulses. Japan had indeed taken the first step in what was to be a vigorous policy of expansion on the Asiatic continent. The Japanese victory precipitated new relations between China and the West - began the era of western finance capital in China with increasing

political control. The important result of the war was the abrogation of the unequal treaties. Military power obtained what diplomacy had failed to win. The emergence of Japanese imperialism and militarism clearly dates from this war.

The extra-territorial rights of foreign nations were abolished in 1899. She got back the right to impose tariff on foreign goods. What for 25 years Japan had sought and nurtured by building her might, was at last fulfilled.

A little later, Great Britain in order to checkmate the ambitions of Russia and also as Britain was pleaded by the western make-up of Japan, she concluded a treaty with Japan in 1902. The treaty meant anointing an Asian power as one equal to the Western powers.

After the Anglo-Japanese alliance, Russia agreed to withdraw her troops from Manchuria in stages. Russia did not fulfil her promise. Adding insult to injury, a railway service was opened between Moscow and Port Arthur, and a Russian viceroy for the Far East was created, Russian troops were sent to Korea under cover of licence to cut timber. Japan was provoked. She demanded from Russia that the integrity of China and Korea should be respected and she should acknowledge Japanese interests in Korea while Japan was willing to concede Russian interests in Manchuria. Russia prevaricated and it led to war. In 1904, Japanese destroyers crippled Russian fleet in port Arthur by a surprise attack. Japan broke international usage by striking before war was declared - the same tactic against Pearl Harbour.

Japan gave a sound beating to Russia in the war and by the Treaty of Portsmouth in 1905, Japan took over from Russia the lease of Port Arthur and the Liaotung peninsula, re-acquired the southern part of

the island of Sakhalin and obtained from Russia a pledge of political disinterestedness in Korea and Manchuria. Even these terms of the treaty reveal the future aggressive plans of Japan.

The Japanese people were indignant at these terms and they came to believe that they had been cheated of the full fruits of victory because the American President refused to back their demands for a heavy indemnity from Russia. They started saying Far Eastern affairs were decided in Europe. If Japanese victory over China in 1894 made them the enemy of Russia, the Japanese victory over Russia made the Japanese nurture a deep and lasting anti-American sentiment to end only after 1945.

The most remarkable thing of the war was the defeat of the European power at the hands of an Oriental power who 50 years before fought in chain armour with bows and arrows. A pigmy hammered down a giant by sheer courage and skill. Although Russia surrendered various territories and conceded some of the claims of Japan, no indemnity was paid.

Their victory over a European power, the first important success won by any Asian country in modern times, filled the Japanese with pride and gave them an exaggerated sense of their strength and ability. The Russian war left the Japanese predisposed to believe that wars would always pay dividends. The military establishment in Japan became more eager to sustain its position. They kept their forces in readiness so that they could strike swiftly again when future opportunities occurred. Prior to 1905 Japan considered her primary interests to be in Korea rather than Manchuria. After 1905 she sought to bring Manchurian territories under her influence.

1,./-/-

The Russo-Japanese war transformed the political complexion of the far eastern question. Nibbling at China came to be universally accepted as the norm of Japanese policy after the war; Korea, Manchuria, Mongolia, and finally, the middle kingdom itself -- the order of the conquests which the Japanese expected in the near future. Japan was now a major power: she annexed Korea in 1910.

Emboldened by this victory, Japan went ahead with its aggression. She embarked on a blatant policy of imperialism which made her annex Korea in 1910, seize Shantung, put forward 21 demands during the First World War, and formulate theories and pursue a policy which made her the supreme nuisance of the pacific entanglement for the next forty years.

* The next phase in the militarism of Japan was the First World War. Already accepted as an Asian power, Japan became a party to the war, partly to fulfil its treaty obligations with Britain and partly to avenge itself on Germany - Japan had never forgotten the German emperor's slighting references to them in the past, nor the part Germany had played in preventing Japan from retaining Port Arthur in 1895.

In 1915 Japan presented to China its preposterous 21 demands aiming to make China into a Japanese protectorate. Because of diplomatic pressure from the U. S. and other western powers, Japan was made to withdraw most of the demands though she obtained some economic concessions in southern Manchuria.

During the First World War Japan cleverly played her cards. She secured separate pledges from the chief powers confirming her claims on Shantung. The opportunity came to her in 1917 when the allies were in desperate state. They asked for reinforcements from Japan. Japan

agreed to supply ships on the condition that England, France and Italy would support her claim to Shantung at the forthcoming peace conference. By the end of 1917, she came to an agreement with America that she had special interests in China. After the war, Germany was made to part with its lease of Kiao Chow and the privileged position in the Chinese province of Shantung, as well as the Pacific islands north of the Equator to Japan.

Immediately after the war, Japan behaved as a good boy. At the Washington Conference of 1922, attended by the Allies and also China, it signed the so-called Nine-Power Treaties confirming the independence and territorial integrity of China and prohibiting special agreements leading to spheres of influence in Chinese territories. After the War

In the post-War period new international forces emerged. On the one hand, the Russian revolution of 1917 and the emergence of the U.S. as a world power had repercussions of enormous importance in Eastern Asia. The Soviet leaders helped the Chinese nationalists in a joint drive against Western and Japanese imperialism. The U.S. was calling for a new deal for China and an end to the pre-War power alliances, particularly the Anglo-Japanese alliance, which had enormously strengthened Japan's position in Asia while the Japanese government was beset by severe economic problems in 1920s and depended on American (in 1921-22) which limited the Japanese navy and affirmed the unity, sovereignty and independence of China. Japan was also obliged to return to China the Shantung province gained at the Paris Peace Conference. These treaties were highly unpopular in Japan.

Intra-war boom in Japan collapsed in 1921 with consequent industrial unrest. The loss of national

prestige stemming from Washington Conference further worsened the internal situation resulting in the growth of contempt for democratic values and a hatred for 'Big Business'. The seeds were sown, to shoot up a decade later, for Japanese fascism.

Many Japanese merchants, bankers and industrialists hoped their nation could win its place in the world by peaceful means; but others more impatient or more ruthless, believed in the effectiveness of a larger army and navy. They supported the Japanese military leaders who insisted that Japan would have to fight for colonies and markets -- that other powers would not yield without a struggle, nor allow Japan to acquire an empire unless it was strong enough to take and hold one. The inexorable growth of their population and expansion of their economy seemed to patriotic Japanese a proof that they were destined to lead and to dominate their quarter of the globe.

The policy of the western powers, which had built great empires for themselves by conquest but denied Japan the same opportunity, excited deep resentment all the while in Japanese hearts. When the Great Depression of 1929 curtailed world commerce, the economic struggle the Japanese were waging to maintain themselves became more severe. Inevitably, the arguments of the militarists that Japan must expand by armed conquest won more sympathy and support. The most obvious field for Japanese expansion was the rich, inviting and vulnerable province of Manchuria.

In the post-war period the Menseito Party, elected on universal franchise, attempted to promote peace and lighten the burden of armaments. This outraged some Japanese nationals, particularly officers in army and navy. The Menseito ministry resigned in 1931. There grew terrorism in which an ex-minister of the Menseito regime and a premier were murdered. Soon an extra-

parliamentary ministry was set up with a naval officer by name Saito. All counter-demonstrations were repressed, rigid censorship enforced, and efforts were made to promote imperialism abroad.

The peace treaty of Versailles in 1919 marked the peak of the first era of Japanese imperialism. The Anglo-Japanese alliance was superseded by the Quadruple Alliance in 1921. Further, the Nine-Power Treaty committed the signatories to maintain the open door and to respect the integrity of China.

Also, Japan received certain setbacks after the war. Japan wanted to exploit the Bolshevik revolution in Eastern Siberia but she was forced to evacuate Vladivostok in 1921. The Anglo-Japanese alliance was abandoned. The Japanese policy came to be further controlled by her membership of the League of Nations, her adherence to the Kellong-Briand Pact and the Nine-Power Treaty.

The economic blizzard of 1929-31 brought a new revelation to the Japanese. First was the problem of over-population. The rigid immigration policies of America and Australia hampered emigration. Japan was growing increasingly dependent on the outside world for the import of food and raw materials, and industrially on her exports. Her chief export, silk, suffered a setback because of economic depression and the protectionist policies of countries like America. Moreover, her economic area was too small to be protected by tariffs. Logically, Japan developed arguments against Nine-Power Treaties (which bound Japan) and for an aggressive policy towards China.

Manchuria

Manchuria was a tempting prize, for half the timber and almost half the coal and iron reserves of the Chinese Republic were concentrated there. The Russians had

attempted to secure Manchuria at the opening of the 20th century but were compelled to share with Japan a sphere of influence there after the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-05. They still aspired to win it all, but after the Russian Revolution of 1917 the new Soviet Government was too busy with internal problems to pursue an active foreign policy. The Japanese enjoyed a favourable chance. China was weakened by internal difficulties and by civil war. By then the Chinese wanting to hold to Manchuria started migrating there; and if they developed its coal and iron deposits they could hasten the development of their backward industries. If China grew strong it could, with its much larger area and population, become a serious rival to Japan. The Japanese imperialists faced a dilemma. If they waited and China were split into fragments by civil strife, Manchuria might fall to them without a struggle. But if they waited and China became united and strong, they would find it more difficult to win Manchuria.

Meanwhile, western powers had agreed to the Chinese right for the tariff autonomy of China meaning that China might raise a tariff wall around her and exclude or partly exclude Japanese goods from the Chinese markets, and raise a national revenue from the collection of import duties, and use that revenue to provide its soldiers with more modern weapons. In such eventuality the Chinese, not the Japanese, were likely to dominate eastern Asia. Should not the Japanese strike before China became a powerful rival to them? By 1930 the Japanese decided it would be unwise to wait any longer. They sought a pretext for occupying Manchuria. Among the concessions Japan had obtained from China earlier was the right to protect some seven hundred miles of Japanese track known as the South Manchurian railway. In 1931 a clash occurred on this railway between Japanese soldiers and

local Chinese troops. Reacting to this incident, which the Japanese had deliberately precipitated, they invaded Manchuria (without declaring war), defeated the Chinese, and declared Manchuria an independent state establishing a puppet regime there. On an appeal from China, the League of Nations Council held (1933) Japan guilty of aggression. At this rebuke Japan withdrew from the League, an act which symbolised her break with the policy of cooperation with other imperialist nations such as Britain and the U.S.

Chinese protested to the United States and other signatories of the Nine-Power Treaties and the Kellogg-Briand Pact. It evoked no response. The Japanese militarists, high in prestige after this successful venture, became more arrogant and adventurous. The men making foreign policy in Japan accepted imperialism as a basic assumption. Early in 1932 the Japanese military and naval force attacked Shanghai, but because of the intervention of foreign powers, particularly of Americans, the Japanese withdrew. Military clique at Tokyo did not forget this American opposition.

Further in 1932 Japanese military authorities installed at Mukden a native but sympathetic provincial government and inspired it to proclaim Manchuria an independent state with the name of Manchukuo. An ex-emperor of China was placed in nominal charge of the State.

As a retaliation, patriotic Chinese attempted a boycott of the Japanese. Another opportunity for Japan. A Japanese expeditionary force landed at Shanghai and Japanese troops occupied the inner Mongolian province of Jehol, south of Manchuria. Ultimately in 1933, the Chinese government consented to a truce leaving Manchukuo with Jehol in Japanese possession and providing for a

demilitarized zone as far south as Peiping and Tientsin. All that the United States and the League of Nations did was to withhold official recognition to Manchukuo. But in December 1934, preparatory to further aggression, Japan denounced the Washington Treaty which in 1922 had imposed limitations on its naval armaments.

Watching international events carefully during the next few years, the Japanese war party noted that defiance and aggression by Italy and Germany continued to go unpunished. Recognizing Germany and Italy as Have-not nations that were determined to win more colonies and markets, the Japanese too joined them (1937) in a tripartite agreement. This agreement, though directed against Soviet Union, was an asset to the Japanese and came at an opportune time for the militarists at Tokyo who had decided to settle the "China question" in a decisive fashion.

X. The third era of Japanese militarism began in 1937. By then, the League was defunct by Germany and Italy while the western powers were being bullied by Hitler. Within China the struggle between the nationalists and the communists escalated. Assessing the situation to be advantageous, Japan launched a full-scale attack in July. They easily overran northern China and drove away the Chinese government from its capital, Wenking, shelled and seized Shanghai, acquired a large district along the lower Yangtse in October 1938, and then captured both Canton, the great port in the south, and Hankow, the principal city in central China. The Chinese nationalist government shifted its capital to the remote town of Chungking, while the Chinese communists were driven far inland towards the Mongolian border. At the time Europe was lost in its own problems and the Japanese war against China ultimately merged in the Second World War.

Japan was impressed by the German success and turned pro-Axis. In July 1940, a pro-German cabinet took office at Tokyo which pledged not only to the vigorous persecution of the war in China, but also to the creation of a Japanese controlled greater East Asia. In September, Japan became a full-fledged member of the Axis. Japan extorted from the Vichy governor of Indo-China permission to land soldiers and use airfields in that territory. Further, the German attack on Russia provided Japan an extraordinary opportunity to expand its war with China and its supremacy through the Far East and the Pacific. The Japanese militarists tended to discount the ability of the U.S. to intervene. In July 1941 they moved into French Indo-China and Thailand and professed to establish a Co-prosperity Sphere which would ensure Asia to the Asiatics and rid it of the European exploitation.

The United States which had for some time been protesting against Japanese aggression in China, now became alarmed about the safety of the Philippines. It cut off export of all vital necessary war materials such as oil and metals. Japan tried to negotiate. The U.S. did not consent to lift the embargo till Japan withdrew from China and respected the pre-war status-quo in the Far East. In October, the bellicose General Tojo became the premier. Japan secretly prepared for war. On December 7, 1941, without a prior declaration of war, Japanese warships, planes and submarines attacked Pearl Harbour. The U.S. immediately declared war followed by Great Britain, Netherlands and several Latin American nations. As a retaliation, Japan's Axis partners declared war on the U.S.

FROM OF JAPANESE NATIONALISM AND MILITARISM

The stirring of nationalist sentiment began immediately after Commodore Perry forced Japanese to accept trade links at the point of the gun in 1853. Prior to this European nations traded with Japan but Japan kept them at arms length, as for example, the Dutch being made to stay on an island to carry their trade. But the gun-boast diplomacy of the U.S. shattered the psychology of the Japanese.

Soon they realized that power grows out of the barrel of the gun. The rule of the Shoguns came to an end. The four great feudal lords vied with each other in making a total surrender of their lands to the emperor. They were returning to the emperor what had originally been his, they said, 'so that a uniform rule may prevail throughout the empire. Thus the country will be able to rank equally with the other nations of the world'. Further, led by enterprising political and industrial leaders Japan rapidly raised her industrial and military might.

Once these processes were on, Japan tested its strength against Korea by the close of the century, that is, in just two decades after Japan started modernizing herself. The emotional support to this idea was given by the Japanese social and moral tradition -- the fact that in the imperial throne there was a source of moral authority not committed merely to maintaining the past uncouaged militant nationalism. These conditions made possible a conservative revolution opening the way to radical change. Nationalism and militarism, therefore, were the Siamese twins of Japan's modernization.

✱ What made the Japanese respond so quickly to the western impact is revealed by the national character. For centuries they believed and acted on the principle that she can never be second but always the first. This notion is revealed even till today. The sixties and seventies of 20th century witnessed the race of Economic Growth Rate. Of all the developed nations of the world, Japan maintained the highest growth rate on average. And we have witnessed a sensational event in the seventies which goes to confirm the Japanese belief that they should never be second. Kawabata, a Nobel Prize winner in literature, committed harakiri (suicide by disembowelment) on the consideration that Japan should become first rate military power since she was already a great industrial power. This innate superiority and confidence of the Japanese was revealed even when the covenant of the League of Nations was prepared. Japan insisted racial equality should be mentioned as one of the goals of the League of Nations. As it was not conceded, Japan always bore a grudge against European nations and this was one of the subjective forces that made them to take to the mad plunge of attacking Pearl Harbour in 1941.

✱ The second peculiar national trait is the adaptive genius of the Japanese. In the 16th and 17th centuries European traders visited China and Japan. While seeking trading concessions, the traders and merchants presented gifts to the monarchs of the East. Akbar was presented a number of gifts by the Jesuits, including a printing machine and a clock. He accepted all of them except the latter two. In the same manner, clocks were presented to the Chinese and the Japanese. The former used them as toys; whereas, the latter dismantled the whole thing and learnt how to reassemble it, which later made them to manufacture clocks on their own. A recent

example is the adoption of western technology. It is estimated that Japan had spent some two billion dollars for purchasing technical know how and patents from the U.S.A. whereas, the U.S. itself had spent 52 billion dollars on developing the selfsame! This adaptive genius of the Japanese made them rapidly absorb the western processes of industrialization making them one of the most advanced countries of the world. Gifted with such an ability, Japanese nationalism is bound to be assertive and even aggressive. The eagerness of the Japanese to westernize themselves was so much that in 19th century some Japanese went ahead to infuse western blood in their veins. She threw away her old works of Ukiyo art, preferring cheap tin products. She burnt her five-storced pagodas to save the cost of demolition. Such a reaction is in contrast with what some young people did in Bengal in the 18th century to modernize themselves -- orgies of beef-eating. A prefectural system of administration, posts, a daily newspaper, a ministry of education, military conscription, the first railway, religious toleration and the Gregorian calendar, one and all, arrived within the first five years.

This process of westernization enabled Japan to successfully draw the veil on the eyes of the west. Hardly a Japanese left for Britain, U.S.A. and Germany to learn things on their own and then return to their native country. Even the political structure of Japan was modelled on that of the west particularly Great Britain. Impressed by the readiness with which Japan westernized herself, the western countries developed a soft corner towards Japan.

It began in 1899. The extra-territorial privileges enjoyed by western powers were surrendered in 1899. Britain consciously wooed Japan by concluding a treaty in 1902 which directly abetted Japanese militarism. The allies were happy when Japan declared war against the central powers in the First World War, although her principal design was to exploit the situation in the East as borne out by the infamous 21 demands of 1915. In spite of the fact that Japan was the primary beneficiary of the war, not China, she was again favoured in the Washington Treaty of 1921 by which she was given a status in the naval hierarchy of the world. Japan did succeed in camouflaging its designs all because of the fact that Japan could westernize herself in the shortest period.

* This rapid industrialization leading to militarism in the nineties of the 19th century and in the thirties and forties of the 20th century was to some extent contributed by the peculiar Japanese way of conducting business and organizing industry. As late as the 18th century, the famous business house of Mitsui gave gifts of umbrellas to their customers whenever they were stranded because of rain. This special trait of the Japanese is facilitated by a feature of the Japanese familial aggregates known as dozoku. It is some kind of a joint family system. Most of the industries from 19th century onwards have been run in a unique manner. A Japanese employer invariably appoints his kinsmen for various key positions, including employment at the lowest levels, if needed. Besides, the employer makes it a point of calling on each of the important persons, felicitates them on birthdays and wedding anniversaries, and goes to dine at their places. The net result of this social behavioural pattern is that every business enterprise in Japan functions as

a family. As a footnote to this you must remember that workers in various enterprises were kept at the subsistence level till 1945. In such an industrial and business set-up there is no room for labour problem. Now you can understand the success of Japan in industrialization and commercialization.

To some extent, Japanese nationalism and militarism can be explained by the nature of Western penetration and the treatment given by the West to Japan after 1869. In 1853, the Americans, by a veiled threat, made Japan open her ports for European Powers. The ruler of Japan, the Shogun, and the nobles and the Samurai resented the humiliation, but they could not do much. Even the populace was roused against the foreign intrusion.

The Shogun was replaced by the Meiji Emperor in 1869. The foreign powers made more and more aggressive claims. To counteract it Japan went the whole hog to modernize herself for the purpose of casting off western dominance. Even before the Meiji restoration, Japanese went abroad to study western science and techniques, and with the Meiji restoration reach for knowledge became more rapid. While trying to learn from the West, they chose to pick up only such things that suited their interests (primary and secondary education from America, university education from France, vocational education from Germany, modernization of Army with French and later with German direction, ship-building from Britain, and so on).

This desperate urge of Japan to make herself accepted by the West on a footing of equality was carried to all levels of life -- cutting of their top-knots, adopting western style of dress, while discarding the traditional robes, for court and official

ceremonies, and some even went to the extent of infusing themselves with the blood of westerners to become modern.

The whole thrust was further given a momentum by the Emperor in the famous doctrine the Character Oath. One point in it was that knowledge shall be sought from all over the world in order to strengthen the foundations of the imperialist policy. This point clearly indicates how modernization of Japan was bound to be slanted towards chauvinistic nationalism and militarism.

While pursuing this policy, Japan beginning from 1873, struggled hard to rid herself of the unequal treaties. It was only in 1899, with the conclusion of a treaty with Britain, that they were able to gain the status of equality.

By then, a particular development in the world situation enabled Japan to gain one more point to strengthen her status in the eyes of the West. As Britain grew fearful about the Russian designs of expansion, both in Afghanistan and in the Pacific, she concluded an alliance with Japan in 1902. With this event, Japan stepped on the international stage as a power of some consequence.

A significant point of the Russo-Japanese war. Japanese attacked the Russian navy and troops before any declaration of war. Cynically England applauded it. The Times claimed that the daring act of the Japanese navy would take a place of honour in naval annals.

However, Japan did not get its due and the Japanese became more and more extremist and aggressive towards the rest of the world. The Treaty of Shimoneseki was a let-down for Japan. They could not get the maximum benefit after defeating China because of the triple intervention of Russia, France and Germany. How deeply

aggrieved the Japanese felt can be known by the fact that the grandson of Emperor Meiji in 1944-45 used the words that were used after the Treaty of Shimonoseki by the grand-father, "the people must bear the unbearable."

Immediately after the war occurred an event fore-shadowing the shape of things to come. After the war, the Korean queen was murdered by a gang of Korean and Japanese desperadoes. The Japanese culprits were tried in Japan but they were acquitted on the ground that they themselves did not take active part in the crime. The implications seem to be patriotic, that is, in the name of patriotism the worst excess could be exonerated in the future.

²For the second time, Japan felt slighted when the European Powers frowned on the demands made by her on China in 1915. Also, America resented the Japanese claim over German territories in China. Japan thought that the U.S.A. recognised her special interest in Manchuria and in Inner Mongolia. On the other hand, America understood that Japan agreed not to claim rights and privileges which would endanger the independence of China. Then there was the Versailles Conference. President Wilson of the U.S.A. showed implacable hostility to the claims of Japan. China, encouraged by the American support, refused to sign the treaty.

³For the third time, Japan felt let down by the Four-Power treaty of 1921. This treaty made Britain concede the expiry of the pressure that was put by the U.S.A. This treaty also meant considerable loosening of the extra-territorial rights of the West in China, an unwelcome development for the future Japanese ambitions over China. Moreover, Japan realized very clearly that the European nations formed a bloc against

her and that she was diplomatically isolated while the American lead in the Pacific was established.

After the Washington Conference of 1921, political opinion within Japan turned against the liberal politics of the day. Politically and militarily, she rapidly developed her military strength although it was a tremendous strain on her resources. The Japanese economy was badly needing iron, coal and even food. These were available only in Manchuria. This situation made Japan think of making Manchuria her storehouse and arsenal.

Along with these developments, from 1924 onwards, the big industrial and commercial firms of Japan established a firm hold on the political parties and through them on the government, a hold which increased more and more with the expansion of her economy and further expansion and modernization of the armed forces.

Consequently, from 1924 to 1931, it was the army that took all the initiatives of aggression in Manchuria in north China, while the big business interests and the extreme nationalists gave it full support at home from 1931. The Japanese cabinets were mainly composed of politicians acceptable to the armed forces. Understandably, a school of thought came into existence in Japan which condemned liberalism and parliamentary institutions as worthless imitations of the West since they tend to take away the glory of Nippon's traditions. Terrorist societies came into existence. A section of the army staged an abortive revolt in 1936.

An imperial order forced them to submit but six months after the mutiny, the basic principles of national policy, as prepared by the army and the navy, were accepted as the new programme of Japan. Since the

climate was so radically altered, Japanese nationalism and militarism came to be felt more viciously in China and later on against the U.S.A. and her allies in the Second World War.

* One more point that has to be kept in view while assessing Japanese industrial and military success is the implicit belief of the Japanese in the divinity of the emperor. The traditional principle of sunna joie was resurrected after the Meiji restoration of 1867. Everything in Japan was done in the name of the emperor. The consequential result was a close-knit national sentiment without any differences within the country.

As the above analysis shows, Japanese nationalism which has been often chauvinistic and Japanese militarism which was a projection of the compulsions of rapid industrialization and westernization and the western penetration and relations with Japan, are intertwined. We cannot just separate one and then say on how it emerged and what role it played. Whether we talk of nationalism, militarism, or industrialization, it is subtly influenced by the other two while the tap-root happens to be the Japanese character.

JAPANESE MILITARISM

[The following excerpt is from 'Japanese Economic Development' by Yoshihara Kunio. It helps you to understand the origin and the final consummation of Japanese militarism. The whole excerpt proceeds logically and a knowledge of it is useful to supplement the material what is already contained in the succeeding pages.]

Japanese imperialism began under the Meiji government. There seems to be a common thread of imperialist intention in the wars from the Taiwan expedition of 1874 to the Pacific War. Certainly it is true that when Japan undertook the Taiwan expedition, it was not historically pre-determined that Japan would plunge into a series of wars in the subsequent years. The actual course of historical events was determined by a complex interplay of domestic and international forces which evolved overtime. Nevertheless, the Taiwan expedition set the imperialist trend which culminated in the World War II.

Imperialism as an ideology existed in the late Tokugawa period, and such scholars as Yoshida Shoin (1830-59) argued that Japan should enhance its national power by conquering Korea, Manchuria and China. This expansionist ideology was adopted by the Meiji leaders, who, having emerged from the former warrior class, were naturally inclined toward the view that the weak were destined to be ruled by the strong. Accordingly, in 1874, the first overseas expedition was sent to Taiwan. But Taiwan was not the major target: it was Korea which occupied the minds of Meiji leaders and made them decide to fight two major wars. After Korea was reasonably secure, North China became the next major target.

If the imperialism of the 1930s was significantly different from the earlier experience, it was due to the fact that militarism was rampant in the 1930s. Even so, the problem was rooted in the Meiji era when military command became independent from cabinet control, and when the restriction that the Minister of the Army must be a general and the Minister of the Navy an admiral became firmly established. At first, military excesses were checked because both political and military leaders were united by personal bonds which had been created in the movement of Restoration. As time passed, however, these bonds loosened and it became exceedingly difficult for the civilian government to restrain the military. A large part of the responsibility for imperialist activities therefore must be attributed to the Meiji government which placed too strong an emphasis on the military in creating a modern nation.

It might be argued, however, that Japan had no alternative in these years when the Western Powers were threatening the independence of Asian nations with superior military forces. They had wrested territories and various concessions from China by the time of the Meiji Restoration. Then, in the 1880s, France colonized Indo-China, England expanded its colonial rule in Burma, and Russia decided to construct the trans-Siberian railroad for the purpose of eastward expansion. Faced with the thrust of the Western Powers into Asia, Meiji leaders judged that the survival of the fittest was the law of international relations and acted accordingly.

It might have been possible for the Meiji leaders to have built up a military force for defence purposes but never to have used it for aggression. It was also to ask only for future trouble to impose what they themselves had not liked (unequal treaties and territorial

concessions) on neighbouring countries. They could have championed Asian nationalism and helped Asian nations defend their independence from the threat of Western domination. In retrospect, pacifism was not a philosophy which would have necessarily led to national ruin, as they wrongly believed. Rather than to Prussia, they might have paid close attention to Switzerland and Sweden, countries which had prospered without foreign conquest, but such was the samurai mentality. The course Japan has followed in the post World War II period was not, by any means, closed to Meiji Japan. In fact, some scholars and journalists at the time argued for such a course, but their views were brushed aside in favour of the expansionist ideology.

Who was responsible for imperialism? According to the materialist interpretation of history, the bourgeoisie was the major architect of imperialism. There is no question but that as economic development progressed after the Restoration, the bourgeoisie increased in power and came to participate in some political decisions. Also, support of the bourgeoisie was important for both political and military leaders: the former needed contributions to finance political campaigning, intrigue, and the build-up of their political influence, whereas the latter needed money to finance military escalation and overseas adventures. Leaders used the opportunity to increase their profits as well as major political and military decisions. Legislatures and elections existed, of course, in pre-war Japan, but the political system was an absolute monarchy in which sovereignty rested with the emperor. The state was essentially run by those who had direct access to him, and most were military men or aristocrats who could in no way be considered puppets of the bourgeoisie.

The leading decision makers were not bound by popular sentiment, although they could not completely ignore it. Military leaders needed in particular the support of the nation for their expansionist policies. Thus, they appealed to the bourgeoisie on the grounds that expansion of the sphere of Japan's political influence would result in an increased share of profits; to land-hungry peasants they suggested that conquest of foreign territories would provide more land for them to cultivate. They also undertook propaganda campaigns to intensify chauvinistic nationalism. Up to the beginning of the Pacific War, imperialism brought about concrete benefits and won the approval of a large number of Japanese. Without their support, it would have been impossible for the military to have become a dominant force in pre-war Japanese history.

Did imperialism benefit the Japanese economy?

Imperialist activities resulted in various concrete economic benefits. For example, territorial expansion eased the pressure on the land which had built up because of population increase. Reparations obtained after the Sino-Japanese War made it possible for Japan to adopt the gold standard and also to construct the Yahata Steel Mill, the first large-scale integrated steel mill in Japan. The various commercial concessions Japan obtained by the actual demonstration or threat of force promoted the country's export industry. Primary products, such as sugar, pulp, iron ore, etc. were brought back to Japan either at concessionary rates or without compensation. Further, militarization required domestic production of armaments and basic materials, and thus became the driving force for the development of heavy industry.

PAPER - II MODERN WORLD - SECTION 'C'

E G Y P T

(MOHAMED ALI (1805 - 1849) = 44 yrs

An Albanian, the Effendi and England were the unconscious instruments in the making of modern Egypt. Both Mohamed Ali and Ismail Pasha encouraged westernization of Egypt although their personal ambition was the primary motive force ^{in all} / they did. The British, partly because of misconstrued fears, and partly because of the invisible pulls of the capitalistic logic, added fuel to the fire of the middle-class demands as represented by the Effendi.

The rise of Mohamed Ali to power was because of an accidental choice of the Sultan of Turkey in the wake of the French invasion and part occupation of Egypt. Mohamed Ali was sent to Egypt with a force of Albanians by the Porte to drive out the French. Earlier he secured by intrigue the command of the Albanian contingent.

The character and career of Mohamed Ali belong to medieval history, but no one can dispute the fact that he was the founder of modern Egypt. First he was a tax collector of the Turkish Pasha and then became a successful tobacco trader. Later he joined the Albanian contingent of the porte or the Turkish Pasha. He was as alien to Egypt and unlettered as any commander of the day. "The only books I ever read are men's faces and they never mislead me". Hence, he used his power with skill, deceit and ruthlessness.

After the defeat of Napoleon, the British restored the power of the Sultan but the Mamelukes still fought among themselves and together they fought the Turkish

mercenaries. Since the departure of the French left a political vacuum, it was exploited by the Albanian adventurer, Mohamed Ali. From the very beginning he knew that he must get rid of the Mamelukes. As a knave he encouraged one leading Mameluke, Bardissi, to impose heavy taxes. When there was hue and cry in Cairo, he ordered Bardissi to remit the taxes. For this act the populace of Cairo hailed him as a hero. Later he very cleverly engineered riots of Cairo to drive away Kurshid Pasha of Egypt.

To begin with, in 1805 the Rector of the Muslim University and Umar Makram, the head of religious nobility, chose Ali as their leader. Mohamed Ali was still the Commander of the Albanian forces and nominally in the service of Turkey. Inevitably this demand of the Muslim leaders was turned down by the Governor but they brought the people of Cairo into the streets and organized demonstrations against the Turks. They even went ahead with their design by investing the Albanian with fur, with a mantle and a robe of office. Ultimately the Sultan of Turkey withdrew his Pasha from Cairo and appointed Mohamed Ali as the Governor in 1805.

Since Mohamed Ali was an ambitious person, he turned his attention towards the Mamelukes, who were the ruling elite. Long back they were introduced from the Caucasus region by the Fatima Caliphs. In the beginning they did some constructive work but after the Turkish conquest of Egypt they were reduced to a gang of robbers since they had no more political power. The Porte was clever in dividing authority between their representative, the Pasha, and the Diwan of Notables and 24 Mameluke Beys. The latter exercised a watch over the Pasha. Whenever the Pasha showed some authority or fair play, the Mamelukes would league against him and agitate for his resignation.

For the second time, the Mamelukes received a setback when they were defeated by Napoleon. When the British again landed in 1807 favouring the Mamelukes they were defeated. The way in which Mohamed Ali got rid of Mamelukes shows how artful and unscrupulous adventurer he was. Four years later he invited the Mamelukes leaders to Cairo to wine and dine with him. As the Mamelukes passed through a narrow lane in Cairo, he got most of them massacred. After this event he plundered the Copts who grew rich by lending money to the Mamelukes and Turks.

After this hurdle was removed, Mohamed Ali relying on the support of the religious leaders, went ahead with his plans of self-aggrandisement. It is interesting to note that Mohamed Ali himself remarked that he was no more a Muslim than a Christian - indication of Egypt's transition from the status of a canton of Islam to that of a national state, and from the idea of Umma or community of believers to that of Watan, the father-land. Except for the Greek campaign, all his wars were waged against Muslim countries and with more or less open help of Christian powers. His main strength lay in the Albanian Bhogos while his advisers were European experts. His calm neutrality in religion and politics soon became the basic characteristic of Egyptian nationalism. In this process Mohamed Ali also identified himself with a kind of half-trading and half-religious class, which was destined to become the kernel of the nationalist bourgeoisie which was to bring Arabi, Zaghlul and finally Nasser to power.

In fulfilling his ambition in Egypt, Mohamed Ali began with land. The Sultan of Turkey seized most of the land in the 16th Century and the Pasha distributed whatever the Mamelukes had not seized. And those who were not land-owners were given a share in the farming of taxes.

A few land-owning Fellahs were burdened with tax. Since Mohamed Ali had to secure finances to realise his ambition, he appropriated all land leading to 5/6th of agricultural income going to him.

Although text-books say that he became the sole owner of the land, it was not the whole truth. Wherever village commune ownership existed Mohamed Ali left them at peace. He made the landed proprietors surrender their titles to him and then they were given the rights of tenants to cultivate the land. And the only land he personally confiscated was that of the Mamelukes.

When Mohamed Ali appropriated land, he returned to the State structure of the ancient dynasties of Egypt in which Pharaoh owned everything. Under his aegis a new system of land revenue administration was introduced. The entire produce of the peasants was collected and then rents and taxes were deducted from it. The rest of the produce was sold through a State organization in order to pay the peasant his share of the produce. Although the Egyptian Fellah was once again reduced to the same penury as experienced in the past, the small farmers, in course of time, secured their right to sell the holding that Mohamed Ali leased to them.

Apart from appropriating the whole agricultural income, Mohamed Ali took a few more steps which led to revolutionizing Egyptian agriculture, albeit unwittingly. Each year he decided on how much of acreage had to be grown under a given crop. In 1820 a new variety of cotton was introduced on the suggestion of a French mechanic. Opium and indigo cultivation were introduced on the suggestion of an Indian. And hemp was grown for building his fleet. More important was the fact that

Mohamed Ali began a permanent irrigation network in the lower region. He even preferred to build a dam and it was completed only in 1882.

All these steps were meant primarily for the sake of filling his own coffers, but the long term consequences were momentous. Even from early stages the peasants responding to better conditions, cleaned ditches and canals so that the Nile again flowed over once-neglected fields. Over a million acres of land was brought under cultivation. Moreover when State control was abandoned later the production of cotton picked up. Said gave up the monopoly of land purchase and shared out the land among the larger farmers. The new freedom in the market trebled the Fellahs' income and the output quadrupled by 1861. This boom in cotton cultivation played a prominent part in the Egyptian revolution. Egyptian personnel and even technicians entered the cotton industry after 1820. Mohamed Ali even boasted that he opened factories not so much for the sake of profit but to get the people accustomed to industrial work.

Equally important as cotton was the total replanning of the irrigation system in the 19th century. Mohamed Ali's work was continued by Ismail, during whose reign the great irrigation artery of Middle Egypt was dug. Later under British administration, Mohamed Ali's dyke was completed. The three great canals of lower Egypt were cut and the Aswan Dam was built between 1890 and 1903. With the introduction of permanent irrigation the old village system of Egypt broke down. Farmers became something like professionals. Incidentally the irrigation system led to spreading of a parasite living in canal slime which causes an extremely painful disease known as Bilharzia,

....

which affects more than 80% of the population. In brief, Mohamed Ali was an unwitting founder of Modern Egypt.

The same is the story with regard to industry too. Mohamed Ali ^{set} himself as the only proprietor manufacturer and businessman of Egypt. He enjoyed the monopoly over trade and crops. The monopoly system was extended in due course from primary materials to manufacturers with the establishment of state control over the textile industry. His ambitious hopes of promoting an industrial revolution, however, were not realized, primarily because of lack of adequate source of power. The monopolies were resented by European merchants and clashed with the economic doctrine of free trade which was upheld by the British Government. Although the free trade treaty between Britain and the Ottoman empire in 1838 was technically binding on Egypt, Mohamed Ali succeeded in evading its application even after the reversal of his fortunes in 1841.

While he went out to sow the seeds of modernity in Egypt without fully realizing what he was doing, Mohamed Ali was eager to play a dominant role in the political arena of the times. For raising a powerful army he used French instructors. By 1826 he had an army of 90,000 men along with an artillery equal to the best in Europe. Under the leadership of his son, Ibrahim, this army fought the Sultan's battles in Arabia and Greece.

The first campaign of Mohamed Ali was against the wild Wahabis of Central Arabia during 1811 and 1818. In this campaign he was assisted by French Officers, doctors and savants. Soon the army and navy were organized with French help. In 1825, Ibrahim began a victorious campaign in Morea in Southern Greece where his military success provoked intervention by the European powers -- destruction

of the Ottoman and Egyptian fleets at the battle of Navarino in 1827. Encouraged by France, Egypt turned its attention to Syria and Palestine. In 1833 Ibrahim conquered Syria. The Ottoman Sultan appealed to Britain but Russia stood by the Sultan. Later France, too, got alarmed. Mohamed Ali was pressurised to recall his army from the Sultan's territory while the Sultan conceded Palestine, Syria and Cilicia to Egypt.

Now Mohamed Ali and Ibrahim planned to unite the whole Arab land under their rule. England grew suspicious and warned Egypt not to meddle with the Arab sheikdoms of the Persian Gulf. Encouraged by this development the Turkish Sultan invaded Syria but was defeated by Ibrahim while his fleet deserted to Alexandria. And Ibrahim marched his fighting peasants almost to the gates of Constantinople but he was turned away by a warning from Russia. Britain frowned at this development and Palmerston threatened to chuck Mohamed Ali into the Nile. The Ottoman and British forces forced Ibrahim to ^{leave} Syria and Palestine. Soon, through diplomatic efforts the Treaty of London was concluded in 1841. According to the Treaty, first Mohamed Ali and then the eldest male heir were given the right to govern Egypt; and some amount of administrative independence was granted from the Porte. This was the first step towards membership in the family of modern nations - secured the administrative independence of Egypt from the Porte.

The consequences of these military exploits were many. Half of the revenue of the State was spent on armed forces. Mohamed Ali's conscription was greatly resented. Peasant women would destroy one of the eyes of their sons by smearing it with poison; as the Copts who paid tax were exempt, young Muslims had to cross tattooed

on their wrists; and some Fellahs had their teeth drawn. In spite of all these difficulties, Mohamed Ali raised an army of two lakh people between 1820 and 1830 and they acquitted themselves well in the Greek and Syrian campaigns. These peasant regiments formed the first leaders of Egyptian nationalism -- Arabi and Ali Fahmi. Ironically, Mohamed Ali's tyranny paved the way for other future military uprisings.

Apart from these events in the time of Mohamed Ali, there were a few more which proved to be seminal in the future. He formed a council of officials to deliberate on public business and organized administrative departments that somewhat resembled the ministries of European governments. In local administration, he established a highly centralized system with a clear chain of command from Cairo through the provincial governors down to the village headmen. All these changes necessitated training of Officers in the Europeanized ways of working. And this in turn resulted in the creation of a range of educational institutions and sending of Egyptian students to Europe, especially to Paris. A result of this development was the Effendi, who later acted as catalysts for the transformation of Egypt into a modern country. This new segment of Egyptian society made good use of the printing press that was established by Mohamed Ali - made possible by the theft of the Arabic printing press from the Vatican by Napoleon.

Indeed, Mohamed Ali laid the foundation of modern Egypt, but he left many a task unfulfilled. By the time he died the country fell more and more into the hands of foreigners. Forty years later the Egyptians sought Egyptianization of the army and after another seventy years another revolution was carried out by Egyptian army officers

In brief, Mohamed Ali created a superb national army, laid the foundation of industry and rationalized agriculture. Of course, the country was turned into an enormous galley, yet it was a galley that could sail. In the words of Young, " In one aspect he was unscrupulous scoundrel, in another he was the Napoleon of the East and the national hero of Egypt".

SAID PASHA (1854 - 1863) = 377

It was a chance factor that made Said Pasha the ruler of Egypt. Abbas-I, who succeeded Mohamed Ali, was a reactionary and anti-European and when he met mysterious and violent death, Said Pasha came to the throne in 1854. He was fat, indolent and easy-going. Although he picked up the broken thread of Mohamed Ali's zeal for modernization, he lacked his father's energy and ability.

Barely a few days after he stepped on the Egyptian soil (he was exiled by Abbas-I), his friend Ferdinand de Lesseps presented himself before the Pasha with a detailed scheme for the cutting of the Suez Canal. Barely a fortnight later the Pasha signed the concession subject to the approval of the Ottoman suzerain. Said granted the lease of valuable land and mining rights along the proposal for 99 years as well as the right to use forced labour for 4/5th of the work needed for the construction of the canal. And de Lesseps, his friend, was promised 15 per cent of the profits.

Quick was the British reaction to the scheme. The anti-British section of the French press exulted saying that with piercing the Isthmus of Suez they were piercing the weak point in the British armour. While British commercial interests, such as the East India Company and the P&O Steamship Company favoured the scheme, the British Government opposed it. It was Palmerston who scoffed at the whole scheme. The French won the support of Russia and Austria for the scheme. Palmerston died in 1865 and the British opposition died with him. And Said granted a favour to the British - gave the Cairo-Alexandria railway concession that Mohamed Ali had flatly refused and permitted the establishment of the Bank of Egypt. He also allowed the British to send troops to the Indian Mutiny by the overland

route. The Sultan finally approved the undertaking in 1866 and the canal was opened to the shipping of the world in 1869, six years after the death of Said pasha.

This venture of Said Pasha had very serious implications for the strategy of European powers in the Middle East as well as the fortunes of Egypt in the future. It was the Suez concession that made Britain look at Egypt as a strategic problem profoundly affecting British sea power and commercial interest. Till that time, Britain was content in keeping the French away from dominating Cairo just as they had kept the Russians away from Constantinople. But thereafter it became a matter of vital interest to Britain to control Cairo to the exclusion of other powers.

Fearing the political implications of Suez Canal, British Statesmen took steps to strengthen her defences along the short sea-route to India - in reality British imperialism spread its net more wider. The harbours and docks of Malta were extended, acquired the Kuria Muria islands from the Sultan of Oman, re-occupied Perim and reached a mutual agreement with France to respect the independence of Oman. Socotra was taken and Aden became the protectorate of Britain:

The British preferred, for strategic reasons, the slower but super cape route. For the French it was only a scheme of sentimental and scientific value. And it was the megalomania of Egyptian dynasty and the resources put at its disposal that brought this project to completion at the worst moment for the future Egyptian nation.

Apart from giving a green signal to the construction of the canal, Said Pasha took a number of steps in domestic affairs, which apparently were sound. His final abolition of the monopolies, his exaction of taxes, in cash instead

...../.

of in kind, together with the restoration of private ownership in the land, which was very popular with the peasantry were, in the final analysis, simply disastrous. Both the peasant and his property fell an easy prey to the Greek money-lender who lent the necessary cash and to the foreign trader who brought up his crops at forced sale prices. Besides, private ownership of land led to the re-establishment of the Turkish aristocracy. The consequent disorganization of the fiscal system of the State made it depend on loans from foreign financiers at ruinous rates. The abolition of internal customs was economically beneficial, but it too was a blow to the budget. Moreover, Said is falsely praised for abandoning the economic experiments of his father. Foreign trade indeed grew rapidly with the abolition of monopolies but it could not be taxed in view of the Capitulations, and it killed such infant industries as were still alive. Moreover, his experiments in European engineering were too expensive. His Asiatic extravagance compounded the financial troubles of the State.

To build a railway from Alexandria to Cairo and Suez he had resorted to a private loan. His Suez Canal commitment made him go in for the first public loan in 1862. When Said died in 1863 he left debts of about 12 million pounds composed of his obligations to the Suez Canal Company for his 44% share of the capital issue, of public works of various kinds, personal loan, etc. This legacy worsened the financial condition of Egypt during the time of Ismail Pasha which ultimately led to British intervention in 1876 and the subsequent British rule till 1922.

ISMAIL PASHA (1863-1879) = 16 yrs.

With the debut of Mohamed Ali in Egypt in 1805 the first chapter of the modern history of Egypt began. Mostly unconsciously Mohamed Ali laid the foundations for modernity. Ismail Pashe, the grandson of Mohamed Ali, in a way, squandered the economic gains accruing out of his grandfather's initiatives leading to the financial control of Egypt by France and Britain and later only by Britain both fostered by Al-Afghani. Coming events began to cast their shadows from the time of Ismail Pasha onwards.

The reign of Khedive Ismail was an essential phase in the modernisation of Egypt. Ismail wanted to identify Egypt's phase with that of Europe. He was the first of his dynasty to be superficially Europeanised in education and tastes. To instal in Egypt all the external evidences of European material civilization was his ambition. He was actuated by personal ambition and an inordinate love of display rather than by prudent regard for the lasting improvement of his country's economy.

The emergence of Civil War in the US threw up great opportunities for Egypt. Ismail to fulfil his grand designs gambled - played the game of unlimited exchange, open market and free trade. He lacked caution particularly when he inherited a precarious economy and a burden of debt from his predecessor, Said pasha.

Between 1861 - 1864 the export of cotton increased three-fold and its value more than fourfold. Since Ismail was a man of ambitious ideas, he dreamt of extending and modernizing the economy many times more than the new economic gains of the day. He raised his first foreign loan in 1864 from a British banking house. Remedial measures were called for when a cattle disease broke out in Egypt and also for the purpose of extending railways. Thus

he went in for a second loan in 1866 from a German bank. But his expenditure on the army and the public works caused budget deficit in 1867. For the third time he borrowed from a British bank with heavy discount. Soon the sale of Egyptian cotton fell because of the ending of American Civil War. Ismail thought that he would be able to redress the economic situation by encouraging sugar cultivation on a large scale. To finance this scheme, he borrowed from a German firm (fourth time) with heavy discount. Despite the worsening financial situation, Ismail's ambitions did not cease. He conceived a scheme for opening up the Suez in order to modernise it. Thus in 1873 he found that he was indebted to the tune of 23 million pounds. To gain temporary relief he got another loan (fifth time) but with a disastrous discount.

Even then Ismail did not cease his grand plans of modernizing Egypt. In order to execute his ambitious programme of public works, he welcomed a large number of European contractors. This proved more disastrous. A large number of speculators thronged Egypt. Concessions were obtained by foreigners but they soon found some excuse to break the contract and then get compensation from the government. The most profitable industry was the exploitation of compensation from the Khedive in the appropriated consular courts to which the Capitulations gave them access. So accustomed was Ismail to victimization by these sharks that he once remarked sarcastically in the presence of one of them, "Shut that window; if this gentleman catches cold, it will cost me £ 10,000". The whirl of intrigues, ballet of ^{tricksters} and auctioning of Egypt by Europe, whose thieves were disguised as diplomats and the diplomats as thieves- it was this experience that lies at the root of bitterness and vengeance of Egyptian nationals. It was at that time that young middle-class Egyptians

came into public life and they became the governing class of the 20th century.

Ismail invited a few more financial burdens. In 1866 he obtained a firman from the Porte establishing the royal succession of Egypt by primogeniture in his own line. A year later a firman conferred the special title of Khedive which had in fact was used un-officially since Mohamed Ali's time. When the Sultan of Turkey got suspicious of Ismail's ambitions at the time of the opening of Suez Canal, Ismail sought reconfirmation of the Khedive's privileges from the Sultan in 1873 - hereditary right to rule Egypt and Sudan, enact all laws and decrees for internal government negotiable and contract commercial deals and enlarge his army and navy at will. All these concessions extended by the Sultan to Ismail meant heavy expenditure and an increase in annual Egyptian tribute to the Porte. This expenditure also contributed to the growth of Ismail's indebtedness.

Ismail's financial failure was aggravated when he revived the system of State trading. He made himself the owner of 1/5th of the cultivated area of Egypt and tried to market the produce on speculative lines. Although he lost in selling wheat, he never realised the mistake. He also ran a sugar monopoly and several shipping lines.

Lastly, the personal expenditure of Ismail was an enormous burden on the State. Moreover, he desired to advertise himself. To impress the foreign capitalists he would erect a sugar refinery and equip it with modern machinery, but later it was left to rust. To impress a crowned head he would establish a Luis XIV Palace with all the valets and costumes but later he would leave it to rot. Probably he had spent 15 million pounds on activities of it's kind.

It was Ismail who allowed the subjection of the country to Europe and eventually to Britain. Instead of making Egypt more independent after securing administrative independence of the Porte, he increased the bonds with foreign countries which caused much harm for more than half a century.

Before we talk of the final sell out of Ismail, we have to take note of how he tried to break some of the old barriers. Like other parts of Ottoman Empire, Egypt too was bound by the Capitulation system of privileges derived from ancient treaties with former Sultans. By these Capitulations both European and American residents in Egypt were exempt from local taxation and were subject only to their consular courts. Ismail wanted to end it. After patient negotiations by his Minister over several years, the system was abrogated. In their place mixed courts came into existence in 1875. These courts had jurisdiction in cases involving Egyptians and foreigners, or foreigners of different countries and had both foreign and Egyptian judges who administered codes based on French law.

Another point in the internal administration was the setting up of a Consultative Council in 1866 and later the Assembly of Delegates chosen by indirect elections. To the latter body a great majority of members were elected from village headmen. Ismail did not like it. Although the assembly was a caricature of parliament in Europe and it was primarily intended to impress European money-lenders, Ismail was instrumental for giving freedom to the Press and for launching a diplomatic campaign for achieving legal autonomy for Egypt.

Furthermore, Ismail's positive contribution to Egypt is commendable. Firstly, Ismail wanted a revision of the

whole Suez enterprise. In his words, "I want the Canal to belong to Egypt, not Egypt to the Canal". Some of the concessions earlier given to France were withdrawn. Forced labour also was stopped, but the Canal was completed with the help of modern machinery.

Second, in the field of education, Ismail left an imprint - a system of primary, secondary and technical school was organised. Youth clubs were formed in order to enable one amongst them to get admitted into the schools and later the one fortunate individual would teach the rest at an evening class. Some schools were endowed from the private property of Ismail. And he founded a national library with very valuable manuscripts and books of his own.

Third, it was Egypt during the days of Ismail that gave a lead to the East in the suppression of Slave Trade. Indeed slavery was abolished as a legal institution by Said. Ismail signed a series of international conventions against slave trade. He took effective measures for stopping the slave trade down the Nile and slave raids in Sudan.

The progress achieved during the twelve years reign of Ismail was very commendable. The railway system was increased by 5 times, telegraphs by 10 times. Egyptian export raised by 15% while the population increased by 50%. Port Said was founded. The harbour of Alexandria was improved. The Nile got a steam-boat service. There was considerable increase in the number of new canals and new irrigation channels while the whole irrigation system was re-organised. The population of cattle also increased. Cotton export quadrupled in value and the Egyptian cotton saved Lancashire from complete ruin during the American Civil War.

Nevertheless, opposition grew to Ismail. Apart from the Khedive and his family being the principal land-holders of Egypt, the aristocracy that surrounded them was mostly drawn from the Turko-Circassian families. The ascendancy of the Turko-Circassians (the Parveny aristocracy which held all the principal civil and military offices) was challenged by native Egyptian Officers who resented the privileged position of their foreign colleagues. The resentment against Ismail and the system that surrounded him was worsened by the agitation of al-Afgani, a propagandist for the liberation of Islam from European exploitation while pleading for a strong Caliphate. He lived and taught in Cairo for 8 years. While Ismail's public-works schemes improved Egypt's communication, production and trade, they brought little profit to the masses who bore the main burden of heavy taxation. The strong under-current of popular discontent was added to the nationalist criticism of Ismail for favouring Europeans, his financial policy and the preference that he showed for the Turko-Circassians. Thus, in the Assembly and the army and among the western intelligentsia, politically conscious individuals and groups began to emerge who drew their ideas from both western and Islamic sources. The first nationalist newspapers appeared in 1877 and the slogan 'Egypt for the Egyptians' began to be heard.

And by the year 1875 Ismail's debts mounted to 91 million pounds, and Ismail was short of money to pay his next: payment of interest on the loans that were already contracted. Confronted with their situation, he disposed of 44% share in the capital of the Suez Canal Company. By April 1876, the State was bankrupt. An international Caisse de la Dette Publique was sold up. Further, this resulted in the French and the British Commissioners

receiving Egyptian revenues, supervising the railways and the port of Alexandria while maintaining the payments due to the creditors. In short, the bailiffs were in and the dual control of Britain and France began to regulate the public life of Egypt. Ismail, however, was not willing to yield his power. In 1879 he profited from the army demonstration against the European Ministers to dismiss the ministry of Nubar Pasha. He even worked in alliance with the Assembly of Delegates to destroy international control over Egypt. By then his standing outside Egypt was lost. In June 1879 the Sultan of Turkey, at the instigation of France and Britain, deposed him in favour of his son, Tawfiq.

COLONISATION OF EGYPTIAN ECONOMY
(1876 - 1920)

The year 1876 witnessed the financial collapse of Ismail Pasha's regime in Egypt. Since Ismail owed huge sums of money to European investors, Britain and France imposed dual control on the financial affairs of Egypt. By then, the nationalist discontent, particularly that of Egyptians, was gaining momentum. Taking advantage of the nationalist tide, Ismail Pasha wanted to get rid of the dual control established by France and Britain. But both Britain and France got Ismail Pasha deposed by the Turkish Sultan.

This attempt happened to coincide with the revolt of the Egyptian nationalists led by Col. Arabi. Both Britain and France reacted. Britain alone acted and defeated the nationalists in 1882. Since France did not participate in the defeat of Col. Arabi, Britain chose to act on its own from 1883 onwards. And it was in that year Major Baring, later known as Lord Cromer, started managing the affairs of Britain in Egypt for a period of 24 years.

Many attempts were made by Lord Cromer to improve the situation giving top priority to the solvency of Egypt, but all through the period of his rule as well as that of his successors Sir Eldon Gorst, Lord Kitchener and even General Allenby, the nature of their rule was colonial. The characteristics of colonial rule are exploitation of native economy, effective political control while denying self-government, domination of administration by persons hailing from Britain, contempt for natives and the policy of divide and rule. Indeed great claims have been made by historians on behalf of Lord Cromer which would be taken for examination after explaining the broad features of the colonial control of Britain.

Regarding economic exploitation, the sole concern of Cromer was the solvency of Egypt i.e. safeguarding the interest of European creditors. Since this was the principal objective in the economic field, no efforts were made to encourage the economic growth of the country although a number of welfare measures were introduced. It is interesting to note that even in the minor industrial field like ^{the} / textiles initiative could be taken up by Egyptians only. After 1920 - it was during 1920- 23 -that a group of industrial undertakings came up under the leadership of Misr Bank. And all through this period Britain concentrated on protecting the Suez Canal and thereby its global strategic interests.

Regarding political affairs also although a legislative assembly and the cabinet system were permitted, they could not make much headway since British interest always pre-dominated over that of the nationalists' interests. A well-thought out administrative structure was created by Cromer. The Khedive and the Prime Minister had to accept the advice of the British Agent and Consul General, Lord Cromer. Each Egyptian minister had his British adviser and each provincial Governor, his British inspector, who, through direct access to Cromer, wielded the actual power of government.

While the basic political structure was in the hands of Lord Cromer and later in the hands of his successors, none of these chief British executives ever gave a thought to the self-government of Egyptians. All the time the top men assessed that Egypt was not fit enough to carry its own government. Indeed during the days of Sir Eldon Gorst the existing legislature was reorganised, but it did not mean much. After that, no serious thought was given to the self-government of Egyptians because of the First World War and its aftermath.

...../.

In like manner the administrative system, too, was totally under the control of Britons. In the days of Lord Cromer able British administrators were appointed but later second-ranking Britons came to man the administration. Lord Cromer was both out of touch and out of sympathy with the new generation of Egyptians. The occupation of Egypt had become to all intents and purposes permanent and its consequent growth of the British official establishment created frustration among the educated Egyptians, whose resentment became increasingly articulate. Added to this, the British reliance on Christian bureaucracy and the Turkish and Labanike Beys added insult to injury.

The period of British rule during 1876 to 1920 also witnessed the British contempt for the capability and integrity of the natives. However, as the calibre of the British administrative personnel declined, tension between ordinary Egyptians and the average Britons increased. Such as estrangement between the rulers and the ruled logically preceptitated ugly incidents like that of Dinshawai in 1906.

Leaving aside the general nature of the colonial rule of Britain we can examine in more details its nature during the time of Lord Cromer and his successors.

It is claimed by British historians that Cromer did a lot of good to Egypt: restored the solvency of Egypt, extended the crop area by nearly 1/5th in the 90s because of the completion of the delta barrage and extension of perennial irrigation and abolished the ugly institution of the compulsory unpaid labour called corvee, the use of Kurbash to control the fellahin, and ended corruption. One more laurel for the administration of Cromer was the completion of the Aswan Dam in 1902. The

cotton crop was trebled and the sugar crop more than doubled. The country was covered with light railways and roads for marketing its produce. And the peasant was no longer plundered by the Greek money-lender, thanks to the law courts and land banks.

All these claims are debatable. One of the motives for the British occupation was to see that Egypt paid its taxes. Its European mandate was that of a receivership for the European creditors of Egypt. Since the Egyptian solvency practically had a British guarantee, European creditors could have allowed a reduction in Egyptian liabilities. But they did not. If Egypt was to become a paying proposition, it was essential that all real profits should be used for remunerative replacement of productive plants and for promoting production. On the other hand, France created every possible difficulty in the way of British reconstruction while holding 2/3rds of the debts. After agreeing ¹ for abolishing the French Controller in 1883, the French adopted, whenever possible, legal proceedings, to thwart the British effort to avoid another bankruptcy. A conference in London in 1884 failed to get a revision of the debt. Another conference, a year later, only permitted a further extension of the existing international controls.

Faced with a difficult situation, Britain resorted to certain unpopular measures which proved detrimental to Egypt. In order to obtain some money from the new tobacco duties, the administration of Cromer sacrificed the native industry by prohibiting the cultivation of tobacco. It was more unfortunate that Britain failed to redistribute the incidence of taxation as it existed then and which fell almost entirely on the land worker while leaving his landlord very lightly burdened, and the

foreigner almost entirely exempt. No, Lord Cromer could not reduce the debt, say the nationalists. The total deduction was only 9 million pounds and that too was mostly to pay off the expenses of British intervention. At the end of Lord Cromer's rule the capital value of the debt was much the same as it was in the beginning. It is but natural for the Egyptian nationalists to claim that had they been left alone, they could have got from Europe an equitable reduction of the usurious debts and revision of the Capitulations that aggravated the burden of its charge. They even claim that during the days of Arabi there was a budget surplus of nearly half a million Egyptian pounds and that Ismail had reduced the debt more than Cromer ever did.

The Egyptians dispute the other claims too. The kurbash or the whip made out of the hide of hippo was the main instrument of Egyptian administration in controlling the Fellahs. The British made an attempt to totally prohibit the use of it. Although it took some time, the prohibition came into force by the end of the 19th Century. Indeed the nationalist Egyptians claim that they would have preferred to be chastised with the kurbash than with scorpions.

Lord Cromer claimed that he abolished the three evils of Egypt. The first was the corvee or forced labour which fell very heavily on the poorest Fellahin. After its abolition the corvee only survived in the Nile Register from which the peasants could be called out for patrolling and cutting the dykes during the inundation of Nile. But the nationalists agree that the Fellahin, in fact, paid an excessive land tax which could have been easily reduced. The second evil was conscription. Since the conditions of service in the armed forces were improved,

any
army career became as popular as / other. The Anglo-Egyptian army acquitted itself very well in Sudan. It rehabilitated the reputation of the Egyptian army, which, in turn, added to the self-respect of the Egyptian nationalists. The third evil was corruption associated with collection. In this field Cromer was not much of a success.

But in one respect Cromer was a failure. After the British rule was established whatever that remained of Mohamed Ali's enterprise in the field of education was abandoned. By the time Cromer left, barely 165,000 students were in schools.

Furthermore, the British policy of respecting Islam not only as the State religion but as a social regime, postponed any reform of social life with regard to slavery and subjection of women. Slave trading was effectively stopped but domestic slavery was tolerated.

And with regard to employment opportunities the Egyptians were losers. Vacancies came to be almost invariably filled by Englishmen - at first as experts and later just because they were English. At times efforts were made to check this process. The results were not encouraging. Egyptians either held sinecures or second ranking posts. The Anglo-Egyptian Civil Service regularly recruited men who were entitled to permanent employment and pension. The conviction was maintained that Egyptian was being educated by exports; but in fact it employed more members of British ruling class than what was compatible with its own level of education. Even Lord Cromer stopped the establishment of national university in 1905 while Zaghlul was the Minister of Education.

After Cromer left, Sir Eldon Gorst was appointed in 1907. In Britain a Liberal Government was in power, which believed in relaxed British control. Sir Gorst

could not reverse the earlier policy as the opposition within started gaining strength. Various happenings like Dinshawai incident and the emergence of Mustafa Kamal along with the Nationalist party and the perennial intrigues of Abbas-II disabled the British from introducing any meaningful changes in Egypt.

After Sir Eldon Gorst, Britain appointed Lord Kitchener to rule Egypt. He disapproved of any encouragement to the so-called political classes. In his Organic Law of 1913 he proposed to re-organize the existing legislative bodies to give adequate representation for agricultural population. At the same time, the administration provided additional irrigation water by raising the height of the Aswan Dam, and protected the small proprietor from the seizure of his holding for debt through the Five Feddan Law. Political tranquillity was restored and the new agricultural policy ensured prosperity and confidence. Nevertheless, the new legislative assembly continued its obstructionist tactics. A clash between the administration and Zaghlul, who became the leader of the nationalist opposition, after incurring the enmity of Abbas-II, was averted only by the outbreak of the First World War.

In the days of Kitchener legislation was mostly concerned with agriculture, irrigation and transportation. The Five Fedden Law protected the Fellahs from the local money-lenders. A ministry of Agriculture was established and great irrigation schemes were undertaken. Unfortunately war broke out in 1914 and Kitchener could not do more things that he contemplated.

Talking of the colonial nature of the British rule, we have to admit that it was not all that harmful in the economic field. Economic relief came by the end of 1894. After this period, money was devoted to ameliorative

subjects such as drainage, railways, hospitals, and to some extent education. More constructive spending was obstructed because of the decision to launch a campaign to recover Sudan from the Dervishes. Moreover, the financial control of Britain was not entirely for the economic good of Britain alone. Seventy - eight per cent of the Egyptian public debt and joint-stock capital was in foreign hands during the time of Lord Cromer. It was with the intention of protecting this European interest as well as the British design to protect her global interests that made Britain treat Egypt as a colony from 1876 to 1920.

ANTI-IMPERIALIST MOVEMENT OF EGYPT

Britain conquered Egypt in a fit of absence of mind. There is much truth in this old statement. There is equal amount of truth in the allegation of the Egyptian nationalists that colonial considerations prevailed over anything else during the de-facto and the de-jure rule of Britain from 1876 to 1923. And what is known as anti-imperialist movement is associated with ^{the} struggle of the Egyptians against the Capitulations and the rule of foreigners (Turko-Circassians and Britons).

It was during the time of Ismail Pasha that the first phase of Egyptian nationalist struggle began. During the preceding 50 years, inspired by Europe, changes were introduced and they created a small class of young men with a modern outlook, the Effendis. They imbibed some of the liberal and nationalist ideas of contemporary western Europe. This received a further stipulus from the agitation of al-Afghani, a propagandist for liberation of all Islamic countries from European influence and exploitation, and their union under a strong Caliphate.

This under-current of popular discontent was further inflamed by the policies of Ismail. In order to realise his ambitious designs Ismail Pasha not only contracted a large number of foreign debts but also permitted non-Egyptians to fatten on his policies. The predominance of Turko-Circassians in the civil and military offices came to be resented by the Egyptian officers in the Assembly and the Army as well as among the western intelligentsia. Individual groups began to emerge deriving their ideology from both western and Islamic sources.

This discontent was immensely benefited by the freedom that was given to the press by Ismail as well as the beginning of the diplomatic campaign by Ismail for achieving

legal autonomy for Egypt. The first national paper appeared in 1877 and the slogan 'Egypt for the Egyptians' began to be heard.

When the State became bankrupt in April 1876, an International Commission was set up with French and British Commissioners to supervise the finances of Egypt. To cut down expenditure the dual authority Commissioners proposed reduction of expenditure on the army which primarily affected the Egyptian segment of the Army. In 1878 when the ministry of the Armenian, Nubar Pasha, (containing a British Minister of Finance and French Minister of Public Works), ordered some measures for reducing expenditure, like the reduction of the size of the army, it caused great indignation. In 1879 occurred a riot of officers which forced the government to resign. This made the two Western powers obtain the deposition of Ismail in favour of Tawfiq. One further consequence of this was the tightening of the dual control. But the nationalist unrest grew and a riot of army officers led by Colonel Arabi broke out in 1881. This forced the Khedive to accept a nationalist government with Arabi as Under Secretary for War. Encouraged by this nationalist success the Chamber of Notables was bold enough to claim the right to vote the budget without heeding the representations of foreign financial controllers.

Alarmed by these developments, France proposed a joint armed intervention in Egypt. In 1882 a new nationalist government came into power in Cairo with Arabi as Minister of War. The British government invited the Ottoman government to intervene and even proposed an international conference to refer the whole Egyptian question, a fact which proves that Britain had no design to annex Egypt. However, as the nationalist government was dismissed, disorders broke out. In the meantime the

...../..

French government could not decide. British troops were landed at Port Said and the Egyptian army was shattered at Tel el-Kebir in September 1882. Britain informed France of her intentions to withdraw from the dual control. In July, the Khedive abolished it altogether. The net result was a typical Alice-in-the Wonderland situation. Britain became the de-facto ruler of Egypt.

What exactly made Britain to take the peremptory step of establishing their de-facto rule in Egypt is to be viewed on a wider canvas. As late as 1887 Britain proposed to withdraw after three years but the proposal was torpedoed by France which was earlier peeved by the unilateral action of Britain. Apart from this, the principal reason which made British occupation to continue was the Mahdi uprising of Muslims in Sudan in 1881. Britain could ill-afford to allow this fanatic horde to overrun Egypt with all the ugly consequences. Furthermore, the killing of General Gordon in 1885 let loose a surge of patriotic sentiment in Britain and thus made it impossible for the British government to withdraw from Egypt.

the British Civil Service in Egypt. He sought to create a body of moderate opinion. When Mustapha Kamal died in 1908, this policy received a setback since there was nobody to lead the moderates. Soon Sir Eldon Gorst fell sick and Lord Kitchener was appointed in 1911. He ruled the country ruthlessly by imposing press censorship. Realizing soon that coercion alone was not enough, Lord Kitchener gave a new constitution in 1913 as a step towards self-government. It did not satisfy the extreme national opinion but it won the sympathy of the moderates, as for example, Zaghlul.

During the World War more bitterness was caused. The number of British officials rapidly increased but their quality was poor. The press was muzzled, which alienated the hitherto loyal Copts. However, the entry of the Ottoman empire into the war led to the imposition of martial law in Egypt. The political question was suspended while discontent was driven further underground to fester until the end of the war.

The great war left in the public mind a strong disinclination for any foreign or imperial policy. Britain declared a temporary protectorate over Egypt at the outbreak of the war but from 1919 to 1921 it sought to make it permanent. And during the war thousands of Fellahins were conscripted and their draught animals were requisitioned. The urban population was hurt by the shortage of imported supplies, especially of cereals. All told, the idea of protectorate became repulsive of Egyptians.

Logically, the popularity of Zaghlul grew. He made a claim to be represented at the peace conference but he was deported. This led to widespread insurrection among the Fellahins. Even Cairo was isolated for some time. Meanwhile, Lloyd George recalled the High Commissioner and

appointed Lord Allenby as the new High Commissioner. Zaghlul was released from detention and in August 1920 Lord Milner was sent to inquire into the form of government which, under the protectorate, will^{be} best calculated to freedom, peace and prosperity, the progressive development of self-government institutions and the protection of foreign interests. In a way the whole country was brought to a standstill. The British Enquiry Commission headed by Lord Milner was received in silence - an important dimension of the Egyptian Revolution was the use of the methods of boycott and overseas propaganda. The seven British exports were met everywhere by blank faces, prominent men who refused to talk, tight-lipped politicians and Fellahs who turned away the moment they were accosted. Lord Milner lost in the sea of silence, advised his government to give up the protectorate. In August 1920, Milner proposed a definite settlement. Zaghlul made counter proposals. Negotiations were carried all through 1921 and finally Egypt was liberated.

In February 1922, it was decreed that the protectorate was terminated but it reserved to Britain the security of communications, the defence of Egypt and of foreign nationals in Egypt and Sudan, pending the conclusion of the agreements covering these points. According to the constitution of 1923 Egypt was declared a sovereign, free and independent state with Islam as its religion and Arabic as the official language. All public and military employment was restricted to the natives of the country except where provided by law.

After the elections were held more confusion arose. The king started playing a part and the triangular conflict between the British, the monarch and the Nationalists gradually went out of control. Ultimately by the Treaty

of 1936 the British military occupation was ended but Britain retained the right to station troops in a zone along the Suez Canal. Both agreed to renew the alliance after 1956.

✱✱
✱✱

controlled by a narrow oligarchy linked together by marriage ties and by mutual connivance at corruption.

In 1795 Holland was occupied by Napoleon. Holland was proclaimed a Republic while the Indies came under its control in 1799. And during the last 20 years of the 18th Century the fortunes of the VOC declined partly due to competition from rival European companies and partly because of smuggling and private trade by company officials. The mounting expenses of wars also played their part. In 1783 the company's directors were without any ready cash: and in 1799 the company was totally bankrupt leading to its ^{takeover} by the new Dutch government.

Daendels (representative of the Dutch Republic and one of Napoleon's Marshals), who took over power in 1808, worked with tremendous energy for strengthening Java's defences and built a fleet of small fast vessels. Earlier he attempted a total reform of the administration of Java. It was a centralised one. He divided the land into five divisions and 39 regencies, all directly under the control of Batavia. The regents, rather being treated as semi-independent local rulers, were declared officials of the Dutch government and were given military ranks and paid salaries.

Daendels accepted the old Dutch verdict that the Javanese were lazy people. Instead of abolishing the compulsory cultivation of coffee as desired by the authorities at home, he increased it. He did his utmost to suppress illegal emoluments and made efforts to see that all payments were made direct to the cultivators. He also improved the lot of the blandong people (forced labour in the teak forests) by an issue of rice and salt. He also introduced reforms in judicial and land administrations which were later developed by his successors.

DUTCH COLONIALISM IN INDONESIA
IN THE 19TH CENTURY

The Dutch rule in the Indies or Indonesia was for a period of 300 years. The western influence was felt clearly by the end of the 17th century when the Portuguese, the English and the Dutch traders swarmed the trading centres of the Indies. By treaties, by wars, and to some extent by luck, the Dutch stayed on while the other Europeans left. To begin with, the Dutch company established a foothold in Jakarta and their own fortress city was named Batavia. And by the end of the 17th century, unwittingly and perhaps unintentionally, the Dutch embarked on a policy which drew them more and more deeply into Indonesia's territorial affairs.

A mere trading post developed into a colony and then into a colonial empire with Batavia as the chief trading port. Most of the Western Java became a part of Batavia and through treaties the Dutch came to control practically the whole of Java. By the end of the 18th century the Batavian government increasingly relied on tribute and taxation for its finances instead of trade: a toll tax on the Chinese for wearing pig tails. Some of the features of the colonial rule appeared by the close of the 19th century: must the industrious Chinese and the lazy Javanese were accepted as axiomatic truths and on these bases was built the whole edifice of forced delivery. And just like any other colonial power, the Dutch wanted to bring a little bit of their home territory into Batavia, an ambition which made them build canals which soon became stagnant and bred mosquitoes.

And all through the Dutch penetration in the Indies the affairs were managed by a company known as the VOC. The company servants grew extremely wealthy and it was

But during his time, the expenses on military and naval preparations were staggering. For the sake of money he resorted to the expedient of selling land to private persons. He not only sold large estates of land but also the rights over the cultivators previously enjoyed by the government. Moreover, as the pressure for finances increased, he floated forced loans, farmed out opium dens, and introduced a State rice monopoly. He even compelled the banks to hand over their coins to the treasury in return for paper.

The British Occupation

The British re-appeared and conquered Java in 1811. Raffles was appointed the Lt. Governor of Java. He asserted the Dutch authority over Palembang, Madura, Bali and western Borneo. His Advisory Council consisted of one Commander-in-Chief and two Dutchmen. One Dutchman, Muntinghe had a fine record of service under Daendels.

Raffles introduced an innovation in revenue matters in the form of a general tax on land. His aim was to substitute this for all compulsory services, contingencies and forced deliveries. He declared the government as the sole owner of the soil. He believed that this step would free the peasants from servility to their feudal rulers and from the burden of forced deliveries to the Dutch. Thus the Javanese peasants became government tenants paying rent for the land they cultivated. The rent was levied on units of land called 'desas' which was to be assessed according to the productivity of the soil. The most productive land was to pay half its yield, the worst a quarter only. The average was estimated at 2/5ths.

But Raffles could not implement this programme because full survey of the land could not be conducted due to lack of time and qualified staff. The revenue demand was based on the arbitrary estimates of the resident

The old dual system of different law and separate codes for Europeans and natives, was revived and strengthened. But some attempts were made to protect the interests of the natives. Native officials were given fixed salaries instead of being assigned land. Slave trade was forbidden. Unfortunately the practice of force coffee cultivation in Preanger and blandong (serfdom in the forests) was retained.

In the meantime, the Java War of 1825-30 sprang from a number of causes. In part, it was the product of the disappointed ambitions of its leader, Prince Diponegoro, who had been passed over for the succession to the throne of Jogjakarta. In part, it sprang from resentment among the aristocratic landholders of Jogjakarta, whose contracts for the lease of their lands to Europeans had been cancelled by the Governor-General. What triggered off the revolt was the government's action in building a road over land bordering on a sacred tomb. There were also, no doubt, hidden factors of the kind often to be found in messianic expectation of the coming of a Just Ruler who would restore the harmony of the kingdom. From these varied causes there sprang a revolt which, through the skillful use of guerilla tactics, continued to challenge Dutch authority for five years, until the Dutch treacherously seized Diponegoro during truce negotiations and exiled him to Celebes.

About the same time, the Dutch in western Sumatra were drawn into the so-called Padri war (named after padir, a town in Achch through which Muslim pilgrims usually returned home). Basically, this was a religious struggle between revivalist Islamic leaders in Minangkabau and the adat (customary law) leaders of the community. Under Imam Bonjol, the Padri forces resisted Dutch

pressure from the early 1820s until 1837. The effect of this involvement was inevitably to strengthen the Dutch administrative commitment in western Sumatra. Together with the Java War, it also accentuated the financial difficulties^{of} the government and strengthened Holland's desire to find a means of making the Indies pay.

CULTURE SYSTEM

The formation in 1825 of the Netherlands Trading Company, a company embracing all merchants engaged in the Indies trade and supported by the Netherlands government with the king as its chief shareholder, did not produce the hoped for commercial expansion. In 1830, however, a newly appointed Governor General, Johannes Van Den Bosch, devised a new method by which the government could tap the resources of the Indies. This was the so-called Culture System, or Cultivation System. The principle of free peasant cultivation was abandoned completely. The system was the brain child of Van Den Bosch. When he was sent to Dutch West Indies in 1827 to restore their economic prosperity, Van Den Bosch postulated this system. The Dutch king was impressed by the blueprint.

In many ways, the Culture System was the old system of forced deliveries and contingencies with a new look. The peasant was compelled to devote a portion of his land to the cultivation of crops for export while the government would take the produce in lieu of land rent. The products were sold in Netherlands so that the home country could become a world market for tropical products.

Some of the important points in the nine principles laid down by Van Den Bosch are the following :

- (a) Set apart a portion of the rice field for the cultivation of export crops and such an area should not be more than 1/5th of the cultivated ground.

- (b) Cultivation of such crops must not entail more labour than the cultivation of rice.
- (c) Such land was free of land rent.
- (d) Crop failure was the responsibility of government, provided it was not due to lack of zeal or industry.

To begin with, Indigo and sugar were planted. The experiment was a success. Then coffee, tea, tobacco, pepper, cinnamon and cotton were added. There was opposition to this expansion. But Van Den Bosch would not yield. Actually the Culture System became the life-belt on which Netherlands kept afloat: it saved Holland from bankruptcy.

But from 1832 onwards the element of compulsion was increased. From 1833, the price of coffee was fixed - this contravened the original promise. Raising of these new crops proved more expensive and troublesome than rice cultivation. The government turned a blind eye to the complaints since it had to bail out the home government. In fact all the safeguards provided in the original scheme of nine principles were thrown over-board. The cultivators were forced to cultivate government land first before starting their own. Often more than 1/5th of the land was set apart for government crops. Forced labour still continued and land rent was collected almost without exception.

The system yielded the expected finances. A profit of 3 million guilders accrued to the Netherland in 1833. It is estimated that a total of 9 million guilders went to the Netherland - used for the payment of national debts and the construction of the Dutch railways : not surprisingly the population of Java increased from 6

.... / .

million to 9½ million. In some areas notably in East Java, where rice was not-neglected, there was prosperity.

In other areas where the cultivation of rice was neglected famine broke out all through the period of 1830 - 1860 (culture period). The outer islands were neglected. The government also failed to tackle the problem of piracy. Famines broke out during 1843 - 1845 and they made the people suspect the wisdom of the system. Above all, the government at home was changed in 1848 and the Liberals who were in the lead starting attacking it. The Liberals wanted that the interests of the natives should be the first care of the government. A constitutional provision took away from the king the sole responsibility for the colonies and vested it in the States-General. Although a succession of reactionary governments came to power at the Hague, the Colonial Opposition gained ground.

Slowly the system was abandoned. By a resolution passed in 1854 by the Dutch Parliament, the authority of the colony was entrusted to the Governor General and his council in the Indies. Also the resolution anticipated abandonment of the Culture System. The resolution specially stated that the oppression of the Culture System must be ended, and in 1860 to publications stirred up wide support/ the liberal campaign to against the Culture System.

It was from 1862 onwards that the System came to be gradually abandoned -- pepper in 1862, cloves in 1863, indigo, tea and cinnamon in 1865 and tobacco in 1866. However forced culture of sugar and coffee, the principle source of Dutch profit, was retained. On the other hand, it was strictly forbidden to use more than 1/5th of the Cultivator's land for government crops. Another useful measure was the abolition of compulsory labour in forest districts in 1865. Finally, a law of 1870 was the final

shot against the Culture System - government to withdraw from sugar cultivation in 12 phases beginning from 1878. But forced cultivation of coffee remained till 1917.

The same tardiness was shown in dropping other injurious policies like monopolies which inflicted great hardships on the people. Even in 1927, the returns to government from monopolies was 82 million guilders. The LIBERAL Pol.

It is of interest to know that the Dutch Liberals were inspired by the consideration that individual Dutchmen should get profit but not the government: The liberal men were caught in a contradiction -- to free the natives capitalists. By an agrarian law of 1870 capitalists were permitted to obtain from the government leases for seventy-five-year period ^{and} / hire land from native owners on short-term agreements. This opened the flood-gates for private enterprise. In 1886 the value of private exports was 168 million guilders, whereas that of the State was a mere 16 million guilders.

Apart from the slow death of the Culture System in the second half of the nineteenth century, the Dutch showed great interest in expanding their effective control over other islands apart from Java. Realising the great importance of coal, mines were opened in south-west Borneo and the territories of a Sultan were annexed. The island of Billiton was occupied where rich tin deposits were discovered.

The Dutch concentrated their attention on Sumatra as time went by. By a treaty the State of western Sumatra and its dependencies were brought under Dutch sovereignty in 1858. Quick came tobacco planting in western Sumatra. This development was objected by Aceh which claimed Sumatra as one of its dependencies. Negotiations failed and war broke out. A protracted war of bitterness

was fought before Aceh was subdued in 1908.

Lastly it must be taken note that from 1870 onwards the Indies witnessed rapid economic development. More land was handed over to private planters. Tobacco and Sugar expanded rapidly. Coffee, pepper, tea, copra and palm-oil were the important exports to the world markets. Significantly except for sugar industry, there was little large-scale industry. The native industries to survive European manufacturers were pottery, spinning and weaving.

Apart from this development, construction of railways was started in the seventies and by the end of 1900 great progress was made. Telegraph service began in the mid 19th century, and the telephone service two decades later.

Shipping facilities were improved as more ships called at the ports of Indies : new harbours were built while old harbours were modernized. As a capstone to these developments was the beginning of exploiting of petroleum in 1883. Large oil deposits were found in Sumatra, Java and Borneo.

The results of all this progress in terms of export trade showed that it doubled in value between 1870 and 1900 while the import trade quadrupled. In the imports were items like fertilizers, iron, steel, machinery and tools, all tending to enhance Indonesia's production capacity.

The new imperialism or the Forward Movement after 1870 caused great changes in Indonesian society. The economic and political expansion brought a new Dutch population to the Indies : civil servants to staff the growing services of government, managers to run the new estates, and clerks to staff the import-export houses and other businesses. These came to form a European enclave

within the major cities and accentuated the lines of earlier social division, a caste society divided along racial lines. True, the Dutch were a purely expatriate community whose members were anxious to retire as soon as possible to Holland. But many of them regarded the Indies as their home.

From the Indonesian point of view, the growing cities became the home of a new urban way of life and stimulated social change. A new elite emerged under the influence of the expanding Western impact. So did a new class of unskilled and semi-skilled workers who found employment as domestic servants, or as labourers in the light industries. Although the agrarian law and the later labour legislation had provisions to protect existing customary rights over land and to guarantee fairness of contracts for labourers, the mere fact of contract employment on the estates affected the village society from which workers were drawn and played its part in hastening growth of a rootless and traditional village society but not absorbed into the new urban culture.

The history of Dutch rule in Indonesia from 1830 to 1920 demonstrates economic imperialism at, or near its technical best. The Dutch multiplied the economic output and commerce of the islands by integrating Indonesian resources with ^{world} markets and by encouraging the participation of Western capital generally. They took full advantage of the potentialities of indirect rule, utilizing the authority of the natural leadership of Indonesian society in the interest of order and expanding commerce. They exploited effectively the lack of cohesion within and between the various ethnic, religious, and national groups to forestall the rise of political opposition. The semi-slavery of the Culture system was corrected in time by the Dutch themselves, and sincere

effort was made at official level after 1900 to stimulate modernizing trends of cooperation with the Indonesian elite, looking toward a larger indigenous share in both economic development and governmental administration. In the crucial test of the beneficence of their rule, the Dutch failed, not apparently from any malacious design or from hypocrisy, but rather because the system which they developed was so completely alien to Indonesian experience and desires. The very success of their financial, production and marketing operations created an unbridgeable chasm between the alien-dominated economy and effective Indonesian participation. The well-intentioned reform efforts of ethically minded Dutch officials elicited a disappointingly meagre response from those supposed to benefit from the programme.

The Dutch demonstration of what could be done in the achievement of pacification and improved economic output and trade was historically significant, partly because the enormous population growth which accompanied the process precluded any possibility of reverting to a traditional parochial economy. The tragedy of Dutch colonial rule was that it afforded little indigenous experience in handling such a system and also it tended to exploit and to perpetuate the problems of Indonesian cultural and regional disunity. These problems survived to embarrass the efforts of Indonesia to function as an independent economic and political entity after World War II.

were built to move the crops to the ports. The population too increased, but it had no share in the government, and perhaps no other European colony was more completely under the rule and control of the alien governing people than Java. It was the memory of this century that had greatly embittered the Indonesians against 'Colonialism'.

In the later nineteenth century, under the pressure of more liberal opinion at home, the government of the Netherlands slowly modified the system, but more in response to the changing demands of trade than for the good of Indonesians. Coffee, which continued ^{to be} the main valuable crop far into the modern period, was raised under the culture system as late as 1917.

Pursuing the policy of the liberals, Holland thought that just as freedom of enterprise maximized welfare at home, the application of European capital to the development of colonial resources would improve the lot of Indonesians. By the end of the 19th Century it was revealed that this miracle was not achieved. Although exports grew, the per-capita income fell.

Then came the argument that Holland owes a Debt of Honour to Indonesia (draining wealth from the Indies), and therefore, it should be repaid. The change in government in Holland in 1901 provided the opportunity for a few departure in policy. Such was the birth of the Ethical policy. This aimed to devote attention to health and education services and to the provision of agricultural extension services, all designed to stimulate the growth of village economy. The sponsors of this policy also hoped to transform Indonesian society by enabling a new elite in Indonesia to share the riches of western civilization.

But the achievements of this policy were very

..../.

modest. It failed to check the declining living standards and also failed to promote an agrarian revolution. Whatever the new measures that were introduced in the techniques of irrigation they only helped the rice cultivation area of Java. Its effect, therefore, was to reconfirm the gulf between the European economy of the estates, mines, oil-wells and large-scale commerce with the largely subsistence Indonesian economy based on rice or shifting cultivation. In the field of education, by the end of the 30s, there were only a handful of high school graduates and the literacy rate was just over six per cent.

Although the substantial changes caused by the Ethical Policy were meagre, the policy was instrumental for releasing tremendous forces of social change, mostly caused by the force of western economic development. Population grew rapidly along with urbanization. The penetration of the money economy to the village level disrupted traditional patterns. The small group of educated elite were able to ventilate the frustration of the masses in this period of social change. Coupled with this, there was an attempt to modernize Islam. It was in this changed social milieu that a conscious nationalist movement began to develop.

One other result of this system was that the outer Islands were neglected, as rich Java produced all that was needed. The spice trade had fallen away to small proportions. Northern Sumatra was not under Dutch Control: Bali was resentful and defiant of the control: Borneo was mainly jungle. The discovery of oil in Borneo and later in Sumatra had not yet made these Islands valuable.

The continuing hostility to Dutch influence of the

north Sumatra State of Aceh, fiercely Moslem in religion, led to a long colonial war, starting in 1872 which was finally brought to an end in 1907. The resistance of Aceh for so long a time, left a lasting result: hardly had the Moslems of Aceh been brought under Dutch rule before the Indonesian people as a whole, particularly the Javanese, began to stir to the first movements of modern nationalism. There is a kind of poetic equilibrium in the fact that the year when the Aceh war ended, 1908, was the same as that which saw the first signs of modern Indonesian nationalism in Java. Just as the final embers of resistance to the alien invasion were crushed, a fresh flame began to rise, to consume, in little more than a generation, the colonial edifice that was built over a span of three centuries. Ironically, the Ethical Policy failed in certain areas and this failure too facilitated the emergence of a conscious nationalist movement.

In 1905, the government introduced the policy of substitution of Indonesians for Europeans in civil service, thereby granting, at least in theory, greater authority to local Indonesian officials. However, even within the same categories of government employment, the Indonesians were given a lower rate of salary than their Dutch and Eurasian colleagues.

In the educational institutions, the Indonesians had to pay substantive tuition fees, which were waived for Dutch and Eurasian (mixed Dutch and Indonesian parentage) children unless their parents earned more than 1,200 guilders a year. The beginnings of Indonesian nationalist movement can be traced to some new educational institutions started by the priyayi class (lesser military) in the beginning of the present century. Anti - Dutch sentiment and nationalism were subtly fostered by these organizations which remained officially non-political

because of fear of Dutch repression. On the contrary, they believed that Western education would open to their countrymen sure avenues of individual and national progress.

Characteristically, the initial exoression of discontent with the colonial status quo was cautiously reformist, but, more significantly, it also represented a positive approach to the problem of coping with alien rule. Boedi Oetomo or Budi Utomo was founded in 1908 for the purpose of fostering material and spiritual progress. The modest aims of Boedi Oetomo were very much like those of the Indian National Congress at the time of its founding (significantly, by an Englishman) a generation before, but whereas the Indian association eventually grew into a popular anti-colonial force, its Indonesia parallel never matured beyond an elitist infancy and was soon overshadowed by Sarekat Islam, the first pan-Indonesian mass movement.

Sarekat Islam came into being in 1912 as an expression of the anxieties of Muslim merchants in central Java threatened with collapse in the face of mounting Chinese competition; but the strength of the organization was quickly expanded beyond the shores of one island and the boundaries of a single social class. They also enjoyed the advantage of exploiting the general resentment against the Sino-Dutch partnership that came to exercise monopoly control over most of the business of the archipelago. Sarekat Islam thus harnessed both the passions of those who feared the Chinese and the dreams of those who championed progress along Western lines. The combination was potent. Its activities included protection of Indonesian merchants against the Chinese and defence of Islam against the proselytizing efforts of the missionaries. Fearing Dutch repression, the organization avoided overt political action.

have

Sarekat Islam presumably would/ remained an alliance of restless men from the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie had it not been for an ability to reach the masses through its religious appeal. Moreover, the variety of the levels of orthodoxy among Indonesian Muslims left individuals notably free to interpret their faith and to evaluate the claims of those seeking roles as spokesmen. In other words, the organization was able to address itself to some 90 per-cent of the people of the archipelago and, in fact, enlisted over 350,000 members in its first four years.

The speed with which Sarekat Islam grew was costly, for there was neither time nor machinery to ensure discipline within the rank and file of the movement. Each chapter was inclined to follow its own course: even the collection of dues was sporadic.

Partly in response to the Sarekat's demands, the colonial government agreed to introduce some administrative and constitutional reforms. In 1903, Indonesians had been allowed some modest participation in the local and regional councils but never beyond the advisory level. Thus in 1918, the people's Councils, or Volksraad, was inaugurated. Half of its members were appointed by the Governor-General in his discretionary authority while the other half were elected by local councils. The majority of its members were Dutch and most of the others were lower Indonesian officials, hardly making it a representative assembly. Further, the Volksraad's powers were advisory: the Governor-General needed permission from the Hague to accept its advice: No wonder Indonesian nationalists felt completely frustrated with the political reforms.

Indonesia was slow in reaping the fruits from the traumatic influence of the First World War. Although the culture system fell into disuse, the marketing of Indonesia's

.... /.

rich exports was entirely in Dutch hands while retain business was usually in the hands of the Chinese. The Dutch granted no real reforms, no democratic institutions, and did not train Indonesians for the higher ranks of the civil service. The British system in India during the last phase opened a safety valve in providing partial democratic assemblies but the Dutch system opened no safety valves: it sat tight, the pressure rose but silently, since it had no means of expression.

In 1914 there occurred a change in the anti-imperialist struggle. Sneevliet, a Dutchman, directed his considerable energies toward winning a voice for himself in the tiny labour movement of Java and in establishing a small social democratic nucleus largely composed of disaffected Hollanders who had brought their Marxism from home. Had the movement remained the preserve of disgruntled expatriates, nothing would have come of it; but the support of dissident Indonesians was actively invited. Soon the left was transformed from a discussion group into a political force through the recruitment of local followers, including a gifted Javanese youth, Semaun, who swiftly rose to revolutionary leadership. By 1917, aided by the economic discontent caused by wartime interruptions of export sales, he and a growing number of Marxist compatriots had insinuated themselves into Sarekat Islam and gained enough power in that mass organization to dominate the drafting of the league's manifesto for that year. In addition to routine calls for progressive reforms, the great Muslim Movement came out against capitalism that was "sinful" - that is, foreign. The first real challenge to Dutch authority had been offered.

But after the Russian Revolution of 1917 this movement received a setback. Lenin, striving to consolidate his power over a country with substantial Muslim enclaves,

was obliged to denounce pan-Islamic movements. His stand naturally tarnished the attractiveness of the left within Sarekat Islam and in 1920 drove Indonesian Marxist-Leninists to found South-East Asia's first Communist party, the PKI. Understandably, the PKI had a substantial following among urban workers who were denied the cost of living bonus, educated youth without jobs, and middle-income persons burdened with taxes.

In 1923, PKI organized a railway strike successfully paralysing most of the economic activity on the island of Java, which made the Government and the people spectacularly aware of the PKI's organizational power and political potential. Though continuing to work from within for the domination of Muslim nationalism, Semaun and his more famous successors, Tan Ma-laka, also sponsored a rival Islamic ^{association} in a quite forlorn attempt to lure members away from Sarekat Islam.

The Dutch government was alarmed and quickly responded with strong measures. The penal code was revised, prescribing severe penalties for any attempt to disrupt the economy. As could be predicted, the policy of repression only helped to make the revolutionary views more widely popular. The PKI considered the situation ripe for a revolution and for the overthrow of the colonial government. The fateful year was 1926. Oblivious to the total inadequacy of their preparations for a campaign of violence and naively trusting that aid from the Comintern would somehow prevent disaster, the Communists engineered a series of strikes and riots. The scale of the operations was tiny but the coordination of the attack was chaotic. A single spark can indeed ignite a prairie, but only when the climate is right. The authorities had no trouble at all in stamping out the smouldering fire and scattering the embers by forcing some communists into

flight abroad and sending some 1,300 others to a concentration camp in western New Guinea.

The defeat of the Communists and the decline of Sarekat Islam left the way open for a new organization. It was in 1926 that a general study club was founded in Bandung with Soekarno as its Secretary. The young product of the Dutch Engineering College at Bandung was ideally suited to rise to nationalist leadership. He was at once deeply rooted in Javanese mysticism and culture and firmly grounded in Western technology. A man with a foot in each of the two worlds, he was a living case study of the synthesis that was colonial nationalism. Moreover, he was a captivating orator who could both electrify audiences and refresh himself with his speeches.

Nominally Muslim, loosely Socialist, fervently patriotic, he could reach an almost boundless cross-section of his countrymen. In 1927, expanding from the nucleus of a political discussion group, the PNI or Indonesian nationalist party was founded with Sukarno as its head.

It began to appeal to Indonesia's new urban elite. It solely appealed to the idea of a struggle for independence. In the mid 20s, students who returned from Holland, joined this movement. To seek mass support he worked with moderate leaders and re-organized his party.

So successful was the leader in mustering a following pledged to non-cooperation with the authorities that within a couple of years the Dutch took preventive measures by arresting him. By the end of 1929 Soekarno was arrested and imprisoned; and when he was released in 1931 the united movement began to disintegrate. Thus came the new PNI under the leadership of Hatta and Sjahrir aiming to train cadres to prevent further disintegration of the PNI. Soekarno was again arrested in 1933. And the Dutch followed a repressive policy.

...../.

to

The Dutch policy was to stifle nationalist murmurs with kindness, through the Ethical Program, with controlled and cautious liberalization, as with the establishment of the Volksraad, and with police repression. The tactics of the government, reinforced by the organizational inadequacies of the Indonesia opposition, were remarkably effective. During the last few years before the Second World War swept into the Indies, the islands were quite tranquil. There were of course those in the local intelligentsia who wrote and talked about politics, but there was no mass movement. It seemed that potent nationalism had come and gone in two lively decades, from the founding of Sarekat Islam to Sukarno's exile from Java.

The real opportunity came with the Second World War. The cooperation envisaged by the Japanese failed. For the second time the European Prestige was made to lick dust. Some of the boundaries were changed. Although some good of this kind was done by the Japanese occupation, their plan for Co-prosperity Sphere caused misery rather than co-prosperity. The brutal persecution of all resisters and non-sympathizers of the Japanese military force alienated large sections of people. The national leaders sought to establish independence even before the Japanese were forced out and thus confront the Western powers with an accomplished fact.

Both in Indonesia and in Indo-China independence was declared even before Japan surrendered. This was conceded by the Japanese commander in Indonesia when he ^{summoned} 2 Soekarno and conferred independence on Indonesia.

But the Dutch Government refused to accept the reality. In the beginning the British troops held to the islands. Later ^{the} 2 Dutch troops arrived. An agreement

was arrived at in 1946 to form United States of Indonesia which was to form a part of Netherland's Indonesian Union. As expected, the agreement did not function. The Dutch took action in 1947 and drove out the Republicans. It caused great resentment in Asia. As a result of the diplomatic intervention of India and Australia, the U.N. Security Council called for a truce in 1948. This attempt too failed. Once again the Dutch resorted to force. Again the Security Council intervened imposing a cease-fire. In the end the Conference of Hague in 1949 granted independence to Indonesia.

ANTI-IMPERIALIST MOVEMENT IN INDOCHINA

The anti-imperialist struggle of Indo-China was for a short duration because colonial rule was established over the region during the last quarter of the 19th century. The anti-imperialist movement was primarily led by Vietnam while Cambodia and Laos (Cochin-China States) were beneficiaries of the fall-out of the anti-imperialist struggle. The struggle led by the Vietnamese was helped primarily by the Second World War and the consequential occupation of Indo-China by Japan and to some extent by the happenings in China.

Partly Vanity and partly commercial considerations of France brought Indo-China into the whirlpool of international politics in the 19th century. By the time the French designed to penetrate into Indo-China (Laos, Cambodia, particularly in Vietnam) the Vietnamese were proud of their links, as well as what they had learnt from China.

The entry of France into the Indo-China region was on the pretext of protecting the French missionaries who had made some headway by the end of the 18th century, mostly in Vietnam. This was resented by the Vietnamese. From 20s to 30s the Vietnamese persecuted both the converts and missionaries. They were aware of the role played by missionaries in the opium wars in China. Added to this, the missionaries were closely involved in court politics in bringing more wrath on themselves. The hatred of the missionaries made Vietnam close the ports to European Shipping in 1836.

In 40s the French merchant ships and navy increased their presence in the South China Sea following the opening of five treaty ports in 1842. The intervention of the French navy made the Vietnamese government release some of the missionaries awaiting death sentences in

prisons - in 1846 French ships blockaded Da Nang and bombarded the port.

The same gambit was used by the French in conquering Cochin-China or Cambodia and Laos. Napoleon III of France wanted to compensate in Cochin-China for his fiasco in Mexico. Just at that time the French business interests sought overseas markets by making Saigon as a base. In 1858 a joint France-Spanish expedition proceeded to Vietnam to save the missionaries. After three years of fighting the Vietnamese Emperor Tu Duc, ceded three provinces of Cochin-China including Saigon, agreed to pay an indemnity, and gave France the right to navigate Mekong. Five years later the French obtained the remaining provinces of Cochin-China and thus were able to establish control over the Mekong delta.

The provision pertaining to the right to navigate the Mekong tempted the French to explore further hoping that it could lead them on to south-west China. An expedition passing through Cambodia in 1866 established a protectorate over the State. This act was achieved by France because of the troubles that Cambodia faced at that time. They were dependent both on Vietnamese and Thai courts. In the 40s the country was occupied by Vietnam while armies of Thailand and Vietnam fought on the Cambodian soil.

In the process of placating its neighbours, Cambodia lost a large part of its territory. It was in these circumstances that the Cambodians welcomed the arrival of the French when King Norodom accepted them in 1863.

Soon after France fought once again with Vietnam. The premier of France, Jules Ferry wanted an aggressive foreign policy. He emphasized the importance of colonies to French commerce which was then suffering from a

depression. The French alleged that the Vietnamese Court had contravened a clause in 1873 treaty by sending tribute to China. Clashes occurred between the Chinese and French troops in which the latter fared badly but the French navy was victorious on the sea. Both grew tired of the war. Ultimately by the treaty of Tientsin in 1885 the Chinese recognised the French protectorate over Vietnam, granted France the right to construct a railway from Hanoi to Kuming, and conceded preference to French over all other Europeans in Yunnan. This treaty marked the end of the two-thousand-year-old subordinate relationship of Vietnam ^{and} China and completed French domination over all Vietnam.

The conquered areas in Indo-China were, to begin with, looked after by a succession of Admirals. The officials of Indo-China followed a policy of non-cooperation. The entire social system broke down. The attempt to impose the French system was a failure. Although the French failed to impose their system, they did some good work by constructing roads, dams and railways. But the population was not happy with the French. The rebellions that broke out were put down. The policy of assimilation failed.

This led to the development of nationalist parties armed with modern methods of agitation and propaganda. The emergence of Japan had an immense influence on Indo-China. Students who had gone to study in Japan started organizing themselves into nationalist groups. As resentment against France grew, realisation came that good government was no substitute for self-government. The Indo-Chinese representation in the colonial councils was increased. This, too, was not satisfactory.

At this juncture the emergence of Kuomintang in China had once again influenced the nationalist struggle. By the

time the Kuomintang regime was established the soviets announced their support for the struggle for independence in India, China, Indonesia and Indo-China. Socialism had taken deep roots, logically Western Liberalism was not acceptable. The nationalists in Annam and Cochin-China took to Marxist socialism.

The French conquest could never erase the cultural entity of the Vietnamese. Historic memories of the struggle to win and maintain freedom from China were a living part of the Vietnamese heritage. The Vietnamese regard themselves as pre-eminently civilized amongst the South-East Asians. Only a minority surrendered to Gallacization, but the majority of the Vietnamese could boast of cultural-ancestors when the primitive Gauls were rude savages. This cultural integrity and the feeling of ancient superiority did not make the Vietnamese plunge into despair like the peoples of Burma or Indonesia.

Inspired by historical heritage, the first modern political organization, the Nationalist Party or VNQDD, was established in Vietnam in late 20s. Its structure and philosophy was influenced by the Chinese Nationalist Party or Kuomintang. The VNQDD functioned something like a secret society. Then they committed a blunder in 1930. In anticipation of mutiny by a colonial garrison an uprising was ordered. The French could put down the pitifully mismanaged coup.

The resultant frustration promoted the Communists to turn to violence with peasant rage harnessed to Marxist-Leninist cause.

Thus the next phase in the anti-imperialist struggle began with the outbreak of the Second World War when nearly a lakh Vietnamese labourers and colonial soldiers were sent abroad according to French orders. These people

were exposed to trade-unionism and democratic institutions of the West. Also the realization that not all Frenchmen in white suits and pith helmets were superior beings made a deep and disturbing impression on the national consciousness of Vietnam. This naturally caused an upsurge of nationalism when tens of thousands of people were repatriated after the war was over.

The Japanese, who were in occupation of Indo-China for a short time, realized that they would not be able to hold long since they were already facing reverses in the world. The Japanese were half willing to defend the beaches of Indo-China against American landings with untrustworthy French troops in the rear. The Japanese disarmed and interned all French soldiers except ^{for} a few who fought their way to free Chinese territory.

Roughly an year prior to 1945 the communist leader Ho Chi Minh organized a provisional government for Vietnam with the commitment of destroying both Japanese military occupation and French colonialism. Then came the surrender of Japan. The Viet-Minh moved rapidly. On the very same day that Indonesia declared independence the Viet-Minh seized authority in Hanoi. The communists were not suspect because they won a measure of recognition and support from the Kuomintang in China. More important was the American support to the Viet-Minh control over the newly improvised administration in Cochin-China. By then, an improbable drama took place in Annam. Bao Dai who was installed as the emperor of Vietnam by the Japanese in the wake of their retreat, relinquished the imperial throne for the reward of an advisory position in the Viet-Minh.

In the wake of Japanese surrender and retreat, the French reappeared in Indo-China. The French fought the

nationalists. The French thought that the colonial war was ^a/sacred undertaking and it was their noble sacrifice to halt Stalinist expansion. In Cochín-China they disbanded the Vietnamese coalition regime; but determined guerrilla's resistance denied most of the hinterland of the south to the French.

In the north, the Chinese occupation troops did not interfere with the consolidation of administrative control by the Viet-Minh. All through the years of fighting, negotiations and intrigues continued in order to outwit each other. At one time Ho Chi Minh even led a delegation to France in a futile effort to win concessions. France was resolved to decide the matter by force of arms. In late November 1946, the French moved to take Haiphong and its environs.

Even after the loss of Haiphong, Ho Chi Minh tried to avoid full-scale war. He continued to negotiate with the French. On the other hand, the French demanded the surrender of Hanoi. Now began the full-scale Indo-China War in 1947. It was a battle between an army made sluggish by a wealth of arms and equipment on the one hand, and an elusive enemy on the other, whose greatest assets were determination and popular support.

Finally, the crucial battle in the history of South-East Asia was fought in March 1954. The Viet-Minh delayed military action. General Giap used the delay to encircle Dien Bien Phu. Men and artillery were concealed in the hillsides. Bicycles were used to move food, ammunition and even weapons and equipment. The Viet Minh were helped by the Peoples Republic of China. General Giap's army developed the art of tunnelling and dragging the weapons to fire point-blank at the defences and the air-field of Dien Bien Phu. The French were virtually decimated and finally surrendered.

When the Vietnamese wrenched independence from the French, their neighbours followed suit in 1953. The French formally surrendered their authority over Laos in order to lessen the burden of empire. From Cambodia too, the French withdrew and Sihanouk returned to Phnom Penh as the liberator of a fully sovereign kingdom. Finally, by the Geneva agreement of 1954 Indo-China was liberated from French imperial rule.

GCP

C H I N AOVERVIEW OF CHINESE HISTORY

China lived in an illusory idyll for 2,000 years. Walled by mountains and deserts on the west, jungle on the south, steppe and tundra on the north and ^aboundless ocean on the east, the Chinese lived in a world of their own. One 11th century scroll shows that a general of the Tang dynasty subdued armed barbarian rebels by sheer force of his virtue.

From the second century A.D. onwards the insular outlook of China was well nurtured by Confucianism. The people who were instrumental for providing this ideological cement to the empire were the mandarins who came into prominence during the early centuries of the Christian era, or the Han Dynasty. These mandarins or administrators provided ethical respectability to the Chinese emperors by boosting the fiction of rule by virtue. Before becoming mandrins the candidates who were successful in the competitive examination thoroughly indoctrinated themselves by memorizing the official commentaries on the Confucian classics. It was not surprising, therefore, that these mandarins could never think in terms of neither a novel, nor a rebellious idea.

Such a cultivated insularity could be seen in their language as well as their legal system. The Chinese ideograms are to be understood as simple symbols with meanings just as we understand our numerals. It was because of this language that the Chinese failed to quickly grasp western ideas. On the other hand the Japanese, the Koreans, and the Vietnamese developed phonetic systems of writing. A word, like radio, the Chinese could not absorb since they were not guided by its sound but only by using characters to express its meaning. And

as traditional meanings were already adapted to all characters, the Chinese could not easily grasp the character that is given to a new word like radio. Apart from this, the illiteracy of the masses disabled the Chinese to understand

In like manner, the legal system also made the Chinese isolated and inward-looking. The legal system enforced mutual and collective responsibility. According to it, the family members were responsible for one another and all neighbours for the neighbouring households. In a way, everybody watched over everybody. This ancient invention lies behind the network of informers that operate in China even today.


To talk chronologically, it was the Han dynasty in the early centuries of the Christian era that gave a unified empire, for the first time, to the Chinese. From time to time the imperial structure collapsed. One of the interesting interludes was the rule of Mongols in the 13th and 14th centuries. This foreign rule was accepted by the Chinese. In the same manner, the Manchus, who ruled from 1644 to 1911, were foreigners. Whatever may be the empire, including those of the foreigners, it was the mandarins who held the key for success. All empires were served by the mandarins who were well read in Confucian classics.

It was such a Chinese empire firmly bound by the ethical system of Confucius that encountered the western challenge in the 19th century. The whole thing began with the Opium War by which China was forced to open five treaty ports to Britain : foreign merchants could live and do business under their own consuls in the five ports. The other European nations also followed the British example. France and Britain found an excuse in 1856 and asked for more concessions from China. Since the demand was turned

down, Britain and France mounted a joint expedition and entered the capital in 1860. This forced China to open more ports, pay the expenses of the expedition, and accept western legations. Soon after, China gave permission to the missionaries to enter the interior.

It was the coming of these missionaries as well as the earlier humiliations that were heaped on China that precipitated the Boxer rebellion. The origin of Boxers goes to the traditional background of peasant unrest; and it was of the same lineage as the Taiping rebellion of 1850-64. At the very outset, the Empress opposed them, but later encouraged them. The Boxers were primarily composed of peasant youth. Starting from 1898 they slaughtered scores of missionaries and thousands of the native converts. This naturally made the foreign powers (Japan, Russia, Britain, France, Germany, Italy and Austria) form a united effort to defeat the Boxers. They all entered Peking (50% of the troops were Japanese). Even the Kaiser despatched troops with the specific injunction that they should make the name of Germany known in China just as the Huns did a 1000 years ago. In the end a Protocol was signed between the Manchus and eleven foreign States in 1901. According to the Protocol, the Chinese officials must be punished and the Manchu rulers were to pay an indemnity of such magnitude that the Manchu government became little more than a debt-collecting agency for the foreign powers.

Apart from this violent reaction of China to the western penetration, some sections of China thought of a different answer in the 70s and 80s. Leading officials launched schemes for western type of industrialization and governmental reforms. These efforts culminated in the form of nationalist revolution in 1911. The nationalist movement could not gain the right momentum because of Year

betrayal
ambition and  and Dr. Sun's inability to deal with practicalities and the very complexity of the challenge posed by these.

Just at that time the threat from Japan became more ominous. But Chiang regarded the rise of communism to be a disease of the heart. Following the purge of 1927, the Communists founded a Chinese Soviet Republic in south-eastern China in 1931. By then, the Japanese menace became a reality. Even then, Chiang launched four major campaigns against the communists. It was only in 1933 that Chiang was able to drive away the communists - driven away from Juichin the communists retreated into Yunnan mountains in 1935, known as the legendary long March.

While Chiang was chasing the communists, the Japanese struck deeper into China. When the situation grew worse, Chiang was forced by public opinion to form a united front with the communists. Despite this agreement, Chiang never withdrew his blockading forces.

The Japanese continued to advance. For the Chinese people the coming of the Japanese meant suffering and death on a scale difficult to comprehend. In 10 days in 1937, for example, the Japanese onslaught reduced the population of the city of Nanking from 1,100,000 to 2,50,000. But even as they suffered and died the Chinese people achieved, paradoxically, a kind of nationhood they had never known before. Chiang Kai-shek had imposed unity upon them by defeating the Warlords: the Japanese, by trying and failing to subdue China, created a Chinese nation.

First, Chiang moved his capital from Nanking to Hankow and in 1938 to Chung-king. It was here that China remained at bay till the end of the Second World War.

As Chiang moved into the new capital, the Japanese tried to cut off China from the outside world by capturing

Hong Kong, Canton, Indo-China, and Burma. The government of Chiang was completely shaken. After eight years of gruelling war, the majority of China's three million battle casualties were Chiang's forces. The economy was in shambles. From 1941 the government accepted rice in place of money as land tax and disbursed the rice as salary to officials.

On the other hand, the communists were high and dry. Since they started with nothing, they had everything to gain. Starting from a party of 40,000 members in 1937, it became 1.2 million. They also controlled the better part of five provinces. A civil war broke out by the end of 1945. Chiang's forces were intrinsically weak. The communist turned their attention to Manchuria and by 1948 they equalled the nationalists in fire power and men.

Then came the final blow at the end of 1948, near Hsuehchow, where the communist decimated Chiang's last good divisions. Chiang fled to Formosa, and the Communist Republic was proclaimed in 1949.

THE OPIUM WARS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TREATY PORT SYSTEM IN CHINA BETWEEN 1840 AND 1860

The Treaty Port System or the grudging concessions given by China to western foreign traders between 1840 and 1860 was in appearance the bullying of the Chinese dragon by the Lilliputians of foreign traders. In reality what it signifies is something momentous in the history of civilizations. What was brought home in the confrontation between the foreign traders and the Chinese empire was the conflict of two different ethoses, that is, characteristic spirit and beliefs of two different civilizations. And the Opium Wars were instrumenta in focusing the conflict of two distinct civilizations who radically differed from each other. Gaining by this experience, the foreign traders, as supported by their governments, gradually spread their tentacles and ultimately came to the point of partitioning the whole of China.

The first contact with China was established by the Portuguese in the 16th century, but it did not reveal much. But with the coming of the East India Company the situation began to radically alter. The imperial government and the officials of China treated the growing number of foreigners as irritating intruders who can be easily brushed aside. Indicating this mood the imperial government established a Bureau of Barbarians and time and again the imperial government assigned tasks to its Viceroys or officials to deal with the intemperate behaviour of foreigners.

The primary aim of foreigners was trade and for which they paid precious metal as exchange. When the traders realized that much precious metal was going to China they accidentally (primarily the East India Company) found that opium could be exported to China in an

.../.

unlimited quantity. Opium was indeed known to the Chinese much earlier but with the abundance ^{of} opium the Chinese started to consume it on a large scale making it a national vice. The English thought they were right in exporting opium which was demanded by the Chinese; on the other hand, the Chinese regarded it as impudent on the part of English to dump opium.

By then, the complex of British politics changed at home. Britain started flexing her muscles as her industrial and military might grew. A representative of this new spirit was Palmerston, the prime Minister of Britain. Carried away by the strength and pride of the age, Palmerston appointed Napier as the representative of the British Government. Not knowing the attitude of the Chinese Government, Napier tried his best to establish direct contact with the Viceroy since he was the accredited diplomatic representative of Britain. The Chinese, on the other hand, treated him as one more pestilential trader.

Irritated by the growing impudence of the English traders, the Imperial Court authorized Lin to deal with the situation. The frustrated Napier retired to Macao, where he died. The Chinese Commissioner, Lin, assumed an offensive posture. He insisted that the English deal with only the Hong group of merchants as it was decided by His Imperial Majesty much earlier. The English found it extremely unpalatable. The Hong group of merchants owed large sums of money to British traders and hence they demanded that they should be free enough to trade with other Chinese traders.

Negotiations broke off. Lin demanded the surrender of all stocks of opium and blockaded the British community which brought it to the verge of starvation. The first shots were fired by two ships of the British

navy against twenty-nine Chinese boats which were scattered and put to flight. The British temporarily ^{occupied} Canton in 1841. The forces were soon withdrawn on the payment of six million dollars, which the Chinese regarded as settlement for the opium surrendered to Commissioner Lin; whereas, the British considered it as payment for defraying the expenses of war. When the naval defeat was reported to the Celestial Court the Emperor promoted the admiral for his success and issued orders that British trade must be ended once for all.

But hostilities continued in the North. Amoy, Shanghai, Changhai and Ningpo were all occupied and an advance began towards Nanking.

The imperial authority in Nanking was in no position to wage war and it was only parts of the country that participated in the hostilities. Soon peace negotiations were started when the British drive cut the lines of communications from the North to the South. Finally, the Treaty of Nanking was signed in 1842.

According to the treaty, China ceded Hongkong to Great Britain; agreed to ^{pay} indemnity for the opium seized at Canton; gave some money as ^{settlement} of debts to the British merchants owed by the Hong merchants; and a further amount of money to cover the expenses of expedition. In addition, China opened five ports to trade -- Canton, Amoy, Foochow, Ningpo, and Shanghai -- with the right of residence for the foreign merchants and with a right to appoint consuls in each port who were empowered to deal with the local officials. It is interesting to observe that the treaty was silent about the chief cause of war-- nothing was said about the opium trade.

Immediately after this success of England on behalf of the foreign traders, the Americans took advan-

-tage of it and pressed forward their claims. The imperial government hesitated, but later it conceded the open door principle and the most favoured nation treatment to American traders.

After these events, the Chinese officials attempted to strangle the Hongkong settlement; denied the right of residence to foreigners in Canton; would not permit direct official inter-course on terms of equality; attempted to keep the trade in the hands of an enlarged monopoly of Chinese merchants; and refused to accede to the extra-territorial provisions of the treaty.

Although the foreigners were conciliatory in their conduct as a group, there were conflicts between individual traders and the Chinese leading to unpleasant incidents. Soon, the crisis over the *Lorcha Arrow* precipitated another war. The dispute was over the jurisdiction at Canton. Hostilities broke in 1856 leading to the occupation of the city in the next year. In reality the trouble was localized but the foreigners chose again to move north and press the issue of treaty revision at Tientsin. Hostilities were suspended and trade was resumed at Canton. But the British and French advanced on Peking while the American and Russian negotiators followed them.

In the end a group of new treaties was concluded in 1858 at Tientsin to replace the first agreements. According to these treaties, provision was made for preserving the gains already made and by new provisions - eleven new ports were opened for trade, free navigation of the river till Hankow, and stationing of diplomatic representatives in Peking. In 1865, the imperial government granted the right to missionaries to purchase land and erect buildings thereon in all parts of the empire. Not to forget, Peking was occupied while the Manchu court fled to Jehol. The Summer palace at Peking was destroyed

as a measure of retaliation for mistreatment of some prisoners by the Chinese.

□ The consequences flowing out of these two wars were many. During the second war the Russians consistently posed as the friends of China. When peace was ultimately made, they succeeded in securing compensation for their friendship in the form of a cession of the region between the Ussuri and the Pacific. This acquisition of Russia completed the westward movement of the Tsarist empire and brought her directly into contact with Korea as well as China, developments which later led to ^{the} Russo-Japanese war and the entanglements in Manchuria, both of enormous significance to the history of the Far East in the future.

✱ Second, the success of Great Britain and later that of allies vindicated the success of modern methods of welfare and the Western civilization. The Manchu military structure was designed to control the Chinese people, but not to resist invasion from the sea. However, it should not be forgotten that the whole Far-Eastern policy of Europe in the 19th century, opening up of China, the entry of Japan into the ranks of world powers and the pacific problem, emerged out of the First Opium War.

✱ Third, although the First Opium War in a way legalized the dumping of opium in China, it radically altered the position of foreign commerce and the status of foreign trade. The war was an emphatic demand from the West for the legalization of external trade, for the regularization of European contacts, and for the recognition of the equality of foreigners with the Chinese rulers. Slowly the Chinese government was awakened to the fact that it must enter into permanent relations with the outside world. In 1861 a foreign office was founded -- a feeble and invertebrate body which entangled foreign relations

for 40 years but it was an indication of the changing outlook of China. In 1873 resident foreign ambassadors were received for the first time at the court of Peking and granted an audience of the emperor. Four years later the first Chinese envoy was sent to London, and the next year Chinese agents were established in most of the capitals of Europe.

X. Fourth, from 1860 to 1895 there was an expansion in volume and the extension in scope of the economic interests of the West in China and Japan. It also brought into focus a new spirit of political aggression which resulted in the annexation of the outlying dependencies of China by European powers. In other words, on the one hand the economic tentacles which were fastened ^{on} China were multiplied and strengthened by the entry of new countries into the competition and by the acquisition of new privileges; and on the other hand, there was a new European impulse towards empire and political annexation, which though respecting the integrity of China itself, gobbled Chinese outlying dependencies and brought Europe through a series of fresh conquests to the very frontiers of the Celestial Empire.

X. Fifth, the wars revealed the total ignorance of the Chinese knowledge of the West. Some of the distinguished Chinese signatories thought that England won the war because she was ruled by the Queen!

X. Finally, it should not be forgotten that the wars and the humiliation that was heaped on China rudely awakened her from her mantle of heaven's mandate and led to an internal stirring known as the Taiping rebellion. It was a semi-religious and semi-political movement directed against the Manchu dynasty. Although it was suppressed with foreign help, it was the death-

knell of the old order of China and a portent to the shape of things to come in the future.

FINANCE CAPITAL IN CHINA (1895 - 1914)

After the extraction of concessions from China by the treaties of Nanjing and Tienstin, the foreign traders or interests were emboldened to spread their net more wide. This expansion was partly because of the growing realization of the west that China was in no position to challenge their might and partly because of the growing compulsions of capitalism in the western countries and which were ideologically justified in the name of the virtues of free trade and the moral burden of the so-called forward countries.

What made the octopus of European finance gradually unfold China was because of a number of circumstances. After the notorious treaties, exports became more than imports for the Western powers indicating larger and larger market for their manufactured goods. Ironically, opium only accounted for 74 percent of the total imports to China in 1905. The Western nations also realized that the opium trade retarded the development of legitimate trade by exhausting the purchasing power of the Chinese. Also, the Chinese increasingly took to the production of opium at home. More interesting is the fact that within a decade after the treaty of Tienstin the foreign traders realised that the Chinese market was limited and the alternative that was left to them was nothing but investing money in Chinese ventures.

Just at this time the special needs of China, as occasioned by the Sino-Japanese War and the inherent weaknesses of China's finances, enabled the Western powers to spread their financial net. Prior to the war with Japan, China had virtually no foreign debt, but after the war it was forced to seek assistance for paying indemnity to Japan. Added to this, China had no capital of its own for

the
any developmental activity or / payment of indemnity. The Chinese were ignorant of the stock company as a form of capital formation. At the same time there was no scope to increase taxes on land and salt since any such increase could invite serious popular resistance. Unfortunately, the income from the customs revenue was fixed by a treaty and could not be altered until after 1930. Briefly, the per capita taxes in China were lower and the empire had to depend on foreign money markets for its needs.

When the situation was so favourable for the Western powers, there occurred a change in the nature of foreign presence in China. From 1867 to 1905 the Western powers had considerable influence in the shaping of policies, as for example, England and the United States. However, as financial investments began to appear more prominent after 1895, the link between finance and diplomacy became very close. The diplomats instead of promoting the mutual good of countries began to put pressure on China to secure monopoly of trade or investment privileges for the nationals of their States. Prior to 1905 no separate records were kept for commerce and trade between China and other European countries, except for Russia. According to modern analysts the first trading power in 1900 was Britain, Japan was the second and the United States, third. The trade of both Germany and France was a little greater than that of United States. Nevertheless, the diplomatic story was different. The most active power at Peking was Russia, supported by France; and the least active for pressing its claim was the United States. The reason for this situation was probably that political ends could not readily be advanced by the promotion of trade. In other words, finance held the clue to the position and policies of the powers.

Chronologically speaking, in the history of finance capital in China, the first phase began when China contracted a loan to pay indemnity to Japan after the war in 1895. A group of Anglo-German financiers outwitted their competitors, the Russians and the French, although they offered less advantageous terms. Later, Britain and Germany were abundantly rewarded during the period when they scrambled for economic privileges from the empire.

The second phase began with the Boxer Movement. The Imperial Court needed money. This led to the maritime customs being taken as security for the loan that was given to China.

The third phase began when events after 1911 created many problems for China. Since China planned administrative changes, it turned to international syndicates for advances. This attempt was not a success and the Chinese government was forced to come to an agreement with a six-power group in 1913.

But the outbreak of the war in 1914 interfered with the lending capacity of this first consortium. President Wilson of the U.S. broke off from the consortium stating that the terms of the loan would touch the administrative autonomy of China itself. Germany too withdrew as it was in no position to give money; but only Japan was left to extend the loan. The same situation arose in the railroad field also. During the war and during the post-war period very little was done until after 1938 to complete the railways.

And it was during these phases that the railway deals were struck which caused lot of harm to China. Either for securing or for neutralizing the railway concessions to others, huge sums were invested by foreigners. It was through these railway concessions that the powers

hoped effectively to penetrate and develop the areas claimed as spheres of interest. All these concessions had five attributes: supervision of the construction of the road, national priority in the purchase of material, audit or supervision of expenditure, actual operation of the road before the repayment of the loan, and administration of the railway zone and the police rights therein. The best examples of this kind of economic penetration were the Russian and Japanese lines in Manchuria, the German in Shantung province, and the French in Yunnan and Kwansi provinces.

The political motivation in the railway investments becomes clear in the proposal that was made by the U.S. during the construction of a railway line in Manchuria. The U.S. proposed to participate. The U.S. suggested that a large loan may be granted to China so that she might wipe out the Russian and Japanese interests while the Manchurian railway should be neutralized and internationally administered during the period of the loan. The British, instead of supporting it, suggested that Japan should be invited, that is, Britain accepted the objection raised by Japan basing herself on the Komura Treaty of 1905. Although in 1908 a group of Anglo-American financiers took up the task of building a railway line in one part of Manchuria, the failure of the proposals of Knox, (U.S. Secretary of State, who proposed neutralization of the railways in Manchuria), reveals the fact that China was denied the right to decide the development of her railways while the foreign nations made it clear that their strategic and political interests were paramount in planning the railway system in China. The failure also meant that Britain reverted back to the concept of spheres of interest and thereby partly repudiated the open door principle. Furthermore,

both Russia and Japan entered into agreements in 1910 defining their respective spheres in Manchuria.

However, the Knox proposals did yield something. As the time passed by it became increasingly clear to the financiers that they should cooperate but not compete in pursuing their claims in China. They also realized that competition amongst them would enable China to secure more favourable terms in contracting loans. Such was the reason that made Britain and Germany sign an agreement with China in 1908 by which they proposed to share the construction of Railways in two different areas.

For China the railway investment of the western powers proved a great liability. The foreign governments were interested in the loan for its own purpose rather than for the national convenience of China. Some loans were not good investments and in some cases they could become profitable only after a long time. Such being the nature of investments, China was handicapped in the development of her communications along national lines for a long time. Moreover, the haphazard construction of railways in different zones by different Western powers served to emphasize the division of China into spheres, a tendency which proved disastrous for the nationalists after 1911.

How did the Chinese react to the whole thing? The Chinese gradually became clear of the potential threat of foreign loans. True, after the war with Japan and until 1900 the Chinese did not suspect anything. But the use made of the Manchurian railway by the Russians made them aware of the inherent danger in foreign-controlled railways. After the Russo-Japanese war the Chinese were able to fully realize the gravity of the situation. Moreover, the provinces were eager to build their own railways

afraid of the growing central influence but they could not do so because of lack of finances. It was partly this fear that led to the insurrection in Szechun province in 1911. In other words, the policy of centralization was thwarted.

REVOLUTION IN CHINA FROM 1919 to 1949

The ultimate victory of the Communists in 1949 had very deep roots. Beginning from the 19th century the celestial empire ruled by the Manchu dynasty as /mandate of Heaven, started experiencing the impact of the West. The western penetration in the name of trade, equal treaties and later as spheres of interest threatened partition of the country by the close of the century. A few years before the century ended, China experienced a humiliation from an Asian power, Japan.

These developments created some amount of unease in China in the form of the Taiping and Boxer rebellions as well as a number of minor revolts, particularly by the non-Chinese peoples who inhabited the Manchu empire. In the late 19th century the vanguard of China thought in terms of setting its Confucian house in order. The failure of such an attempt became obvious with the nationalist revolt in 1911. It was from this period onwards that one can justifiably say that the Chinese revolution gathered momentum culminating in the victory of the Communists in 1949.

The humiliation imposed by the treaties of Nanking and Tienstin were treated as bad dreams by the Manchu emperor, the courtiers, and even the intellectuals to some extent. After 1895 the Chinese thinking section concentrated on a renovation of the Confucian system; but after the Russo-Japanese war and the Russian Revolution of 1905, the Chinese started thinking of political revolution.

In the beginning, the revolutionaries of the day were moved mainly by simple nationalism: getting rid of the hated alien dynasty. The Manchu emperors and the

courtiers did take half-hearted steps to introduce changes in China but the Old Buddha's heart was never for it. Naturally the decaying Manchu structure facilitated the revolution of 1911. It was the victory of revolutionary democrats; but parliamentary democracy was still-born in China and soon the revolution was checkmated by the growth of warlordism, disunity and renewed foreign pressures.

True, the Manchu Dynasty came to an end in 1911, but the Chinese expected that dynasty qua dynasty should prepetuate itself. Yuan got an endorsement of the parliament for establishing his new dynasty. The foreigners welcomed it as they thought that it would keep the country's peace and protect their interests. The dismissal of parliament was also welcomed by foreigners as they thought that things would be better.

But a new development changed the whole picture. After the outbreak of the First World War the European powers showed anxiety to win the alliance of Japan, and Germany was equally anxious to keep Japan neutral. Exploiting this opportunity, Japan joined the Allied Powers and according to an agreement with them, occupied the Germany territory in China.

Japan had more ambitions. They knew that a strong dynasty under Yuan would stand in their way of plans. When Yuan proclaimed a new dynasty, the Japanese presented them with 21 demands. The substance of the demands was to make China a protectorate of Japan. Yuan could not accept the demands. He accepted part of them but cleverly leaked out the agreement. The Western powers were taken aback. As a retaliation, the Japanese encouraged anti-Yuan movements in China. It was a clever move of Japan because the generals of Yuan felt that they were as good as Yuan. The educated Chinese

..../.

felt that confusion was inevitable and the Republic was only a passing phase. Further, they knew Yuan as a traitor both to the Manchu Dynasty and the Republic. In the meantime the generals or warlords assumed the cloak of Republic and rose in revolt in one province after another. Half of China was in revolt. Yuan died a broken hearted man in 1916.

After the 21 demands made by Japan the young intellectuals of China no longer debated the good or bad of western civilization but on how to save China, not even her culture and perpetuation of dynastic concept. Two trends amongst the young intellectuals appeared: one emphasizing on evolutionary change with stress on individualism, and the other, seeking radical solutions while accepting some of the ideas of Marx and Lenin.

No one foresaw what would be coming. Dr. Sun reappeared on the stage and declared a Republic in Canton, but at ^{Peking} 2 the former generals of Yuan chose one amongst them as the President with Peking as the capital. And from 1916 to 1926 there was a complicated and wasteful struggle for power known as the warlord period. The foreign powers chose to deal with Peking as their loans had to be repaid and which were serviced by the revenues of the Chinese customs administration: the customs were collected in the name of the Peking Republic.

Although the foreign powers supported the Peking government, chaos spread all over. Banditry flourished all over. Rich men fled to larger cities and foreign concessions in the treaty ports. Distress spread while poverty increased.

Unfortunately, the western powers continued to recognize the warlords in Peking while postponing the demand for the revision of treaties. They point-blank refused

to deal with Dr. Sun, which served to increase popular resentment against imperialism. .

During the period of turbulence the peasants were put to enormous difficulties. They organized secret societies. One of them was the Red Spears established in 1925 with the aim of securing security, peace and freedom from oppression. This movement was strong in Central and North China. Indeed, there were number of other societies like Long Hair, Yellow Sand, Heavenly Gate, Big Sword, Bastards and so forth.

As distinct from these secret societies a modern peasant movement emerged in 1921 in South China. It became a powerful revolutionary force of anti-feudalism. It continued even after 1927, ready to be utilized by any revolutionary.

Even in the urban areas, revolutionary potential was gradually built up. The ill-fed workers in the industrial centres was a source of potential discontent. The social and economic position of Chinese articulate youth was also a factor in the equation -- ^{disgruntled} / intell-igentsia ready to offer leadership to the revolutionary forces welling up from the lower strata of Chinese Society. Thus, by the middle of the 1920's China was in a mood for one more revolution.

of Versailles.

The incident of 4th May or the movement, as it was called, was the first occasion when the younger intellectuals led a large number of Chinese people, who reacted to a patriotic appeal. The failure of the Revolution of 1911 to achieve any useful reform in the minds of the educated class as well as the growing discontent and poverty among other classes, were focussed in this minor issue of 4th May. From now onwards a more aggressive national movement emerged which was the least inclined to accept democracy as its model or the western powers as their examples.

of

The new ideal sought by the wakened China ^{the} / 1920 was that of / Soviet Union. No one really knew the Marxist and Leninist ideas, nor the real happenings within ^{the} / Soviet Union. Particularly when the Soviet Union abrogated all the treaties entered into by the Czars and gave up all the special rights and privileges and the treaty port concessions in China, the attraction of Soviet Union grew more. The Soviet Government declared that they wanted only equal relations with foreign countries. This tremendously impressed the Chinese. The Chinese were in no mood to listen to the fears expressed by the western powers. For that matter, the Chinese had no freedom to be destroyed and their property was as good as lost to bandits and corrupt militarists. Logically a social Revolution promising to get rid of such parasites seemed positively attractive to the Chinese.

Also the appeal of Russian Revolution to the Chinese Communists and its acceptance by a wider segment of the Chinese population was because of past heritage. By a treaty of the 17th century the Manchus and the Czars settled matters regarding the frontier along the Amur river

.../.

while leaving some areas as neutral. Again in the 19th century another treaty settled differences regarding the boundary along the river Amur. It is interesting to observe that all through her 300 years of contact with China, Russia never resorted to war. Russia never practised things like poison trade and pig trade. Most of all, Russia did not attempt religious conquest of China. And after the Revolution of 1917 Russia pointedly announced her support for the independence struggle in India, China, Indonesia and Indo-China. Apart from quickening the pulse of nationalist movement in Asia, the Russian Revolution had set the people thinking on the validity of many things which they had accepted from the West without questioning. The impact of liberalism on China was very limited, and therefore, the Russian Revolution had a far greater appeal in countries like China and Indonesia.

Lift-wing ideas spread rapidly in the intellectual circles of CHINA. Dr. Sun, who was driven by the local warlords from Canton, came to an understanding with the Russian Envoy, Joffe, who arrived in 1921. This envoy was welcomed in the university circles of Peking. In the same year he met Dr. Sun in Shanghai. An agreement was concluded. Dr. Sun declared that communism was not suitable to China but accepted Russian aid to re-organize his party and collaborate with the small Chinese Communist Party. At that juncture Dr. Sun appealed for recognition and help from the Western Powers. His request was turned down on the ground that he was not the rightful government of China.

Left to himself, Dr. Sun reorganized his party with the help of Russian experts and supplies. His party was renamed as Kuomintang or Nationalist Party. After returning to Canton, he organized an army with Russian

advice and arms. Some local warlords were overcome and the Communists were accepted as individual members of the Kuomintang. Their followers increased in cities.

The Communist Party was founded in 1920 and a branch of it founded in Paris. The first group of 12 to 20 Communists who met at Shanghai had Mao as one of the members; while the Paris group had Chou-en-Lai. Later both these groups merged. Even at this time they knew nothing about the theory of communism nor did they know the Russian language. The appeal of communism to Chinese intellectuals primarily lay in its promised solutions to pressing problems. The Communist condemnation of the past justified attacks on traditional Confucian values; its justification of force offered a short-cut to the emergence of modern China; and its demand for an end to colonialism supported the determination of Young China to terminate the unequal treaty system. Significantly, the Comintern in Moscow picked up China as the chief area of activity in the years after 1922.

From the very beginning the Chinese Communist Party had a distinct character. It was national, less under foreign influence, less theoretical, and more inspired by Chinese aspirations. After a few years, the Communist Party became an equal partner of Kuomintang. After the mediation of the Russian envoy, the Communist Party joined Dr. Sun's Kuomintang. Now preparations were made to drive the militarists out of power and unify China under a left-wing government. In 1925 Dr. Sun died.

A few months later a minor incident occurred in Shanghai leading to one more wave of patriotic upsurge. When the Chinese students demonstrated in support of strikers at a Japanese Mill on 30th May 1925, they were fired at. This event sparked off a more widespread and

prolonged agitation all over the country as compared to the 4th May 1919 incident against the Treaty of Versailles. The people demanded the abolition of foreign privileges and concessions. All scoundrels took refuge in foreign concessions, which were controlled by the warlords. The boycott of Japanese and English firms was enforced in Canton. The movement spread to Hong Kong.

In this situation a military expedition was launched in 1926, called the Northern Expedition, from Canton to drive away the militarists out of power. The troops were led by Chiang Kai-Shek and the move was a success. The capital was moved from Canton to Wuhan. While the nationalist armies were approaching Nanking and Shanghai, a split occurred between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party. The Communists controlled Shanghai and they even increased control over Wuhan. Alarmed by the situation, Chiang staged a coup against the Communist Party in Shanghai in 1927 and drove them from power.

And then Chiang set up a purely nationalist and anti-communist government at Nanking. The Communists were driven away from Wuhan also along with the Russian advisers. The Communists sought shelter in South China and there they began the famous guerrilla period for the coming ten years. While Chiang drove away the militarists from Peking, the Japanese chose to seize Manchuria and set up a puppet Manchu Emperor.

Leaving aside the Japanese threat, Chiang continued his fight against the Communists. Chiang carried out five 'extermination campaigns' against them between 1930 and 1934. The attempt of the Communists to capture cities, such as Canton, was a failure. Mao proved a success with the peasants in South China. The remnants of the Red Army (Communist units of the former Nationalist

forces) joined him in 1928. Chiang was obsessed with the Communists and he repeatedly attempted to crush them. In desperation, he virtually encircled the Communists in 1934 but they broke away from it and took refuge in the North-West. This was the famous Long March of Yunnan close to the borders of inner Mongolia. The Communists suffered great losses but succeeded in avoiding total destruction. In October 1934 the breakthrough was achieved and almost 100,000 communists set out on the remarkable Long March which was to become part of Chinese legend. They covered about 6,000 miles in 368 days and, in the words of Edgar Snow, 'Crossed 18 mountain ranges, 5 of which were snow-capped and 24 rivers. They passed through 12 different provinces, occupied 62 cities, and broke through enveloping armies of 10 different provincial warlords, besides defeating, eluding, or outmanoeuvring the various forces of government troops sent against them'. Eventually the 20,000 survivors found refuge at Yen-an in Shensi province, where a new base was organised. Mao was able to control the provinces of Shensi and Kansu. It was during the course of the Long March that Mao was chosen as the supreme leader of the Communist Party, a position he retained till the end of his life.

While Chiang was preoccupied with elimination of the Communists, the Japanese aggressed more and more. Popular resentment grew against Chiang. When Chiang went to the North-West Province of Siam to organize another campaign against the Communists in 1936, he was arrested by his own mutinous army. Forced by the mutineers he came to an agreement with the Communist Party. Nanking government was acknowledged as the Central Government of China but the Communists established their own autonomous government of the border region. The Red Army's name was

changed to the Eighth Route Army. Both parties pledged to resist Japan. The agreement between the Communists and the Kuomintang in 1937 was nothing more or less than a shot-gun wedding. While facing the Japanese, both the Nationalists and the Communists waited for the day of domestic reckoning.

And in 1937, the Japanese seized Peking after a minor incident and attacked Shanghai. The Japanese invasion soon became the invasion of all China. They drove the nationalist government to Chungking and occupied the entire coast of China. They got hold of the cities but they found it difficult to manage the interior as they were harassed by the Communist guerrillas. During this war, the Communist Party won a dominant and unshakable hold on the rural regions of North China.

During the Second World War, China allied herself with the Allies but it did her no good. The Japanese succeeded in cutting off free China from all contacts with the Allies except for air-links. Frequent clashes broke out between the communists and the Kuomintang. With the Japanese surrender the issues became more clear. The Kuomintang controlled West China while the Communists, North China. Then the question arose whether Japan should surrender the cities to the Communists who were encircling them, or to the Nationalists. The US tried to mediate but there was no reconciliation.

In 1949, the Communists swept into South China, took Hanking, Wuhan and Shanghai. By the end of the year the Kuomintang forces evacuated Canton and withdrew to Formosa.

Why did Mao and the Communists gain support ?

- (i) The basic opportunity for them to win support was provided by the inefficiency and corruption of the KMT in government. They had little to offer in the way of reform, spent too much time looking after the interests of industrialists, bankers and land-owners, and made no effective attempts to organize mass support.
- (ii) There was little improvement in factory conditions, in spite of laws designed to remove the worst abuses such as child labour in textile mills. Often these laws were not applied; there was widespread bribery of inspectors and Chiang himself was not prepared to offend his industrialist supporters.
- (iii) There was no improvement in peasant poverty. In the early 1930s there was a series of droughts and bad harvests which caused widespread famine in rural areas; at the same time there was often plenty of rice and wheat being hoarded in the cities by ^{profiteering} merchants. In addition there were high taxes and forced labour. In contrast, the land policy followed in areas controlled by the communists was much more attractive; at first in the south they seized the estates of rich landlords and redistributed them among the peasants; after the temporary truce with the KMT during the war with Japan, the communists compromised and confined themselves to a policy of restricting rents and making sure that even the poorest labourers got

a small piece of land. This less drastic policy had the advantage of winning the support of the smaller landowners as well as the peasants.

- (iv) The crucial factor was that the KMT put up no effective resistance to the Japanese, who occupied Manchuria in 1931 and were obviously working to bring the neighbouring provinces of northern China under their control. Chiang seemed to think it was more important to destroy the communists than to resist the Japanese, and moved into south Shensi to attack Mao(1936). Here a remarkable incident took place: Chiang was taken prisoner by some of his own troops, mostly Manchurians who were incensed at the Japanese invasion. They demanded that Chiang turn against the Japanese, but at first he was unwilling. Only after the prominent communist Chou-En-lai came to see him at Sian did he agree to a fresh alliance with the CCP and a national front against the Japanese. The new alliance brought great advantages to the CCP; the KMT extermination campaigns ceased for the time being and consequently the CCP was secure in its Shensi base; when full-scale war broke out with Japan in 1937, the KMT forces were quickly defeated and most of eastern China was occupied by the Japanese as Chiang retreated westwards to Chungking; this enabled the communists, undefeated in Shensi, to present themselves as patriotic nationalists, leading an effective guerilla campaign against the Japanese in the North. This won them massive support among peasants and middle classes, who were appalled at Japanese in the north. This won them massive support among peasants and middle classes, who were appalled at Japanese brutality and arrogance. Whereas in

1937 the CCP had 5 base ^{areas} ~~base~~ controlling 12 million people, by 1945 this had grown to 19 base areas and 100 million people.

The communist victory in 1949 was still not inevitable, though all the points examined above contributed to it. When the Japanese were defeated in 1945, the KMT and the CCP became locked in the final struggle for power. Many observers, especially in the USA, hoped and expected that Chiang would be victorious. The Americans helped the KMT to take over all areas previously occupied by the Japanese, except Manchuria which had been captured by the Russians a few days before the war ended. Here the Russians obstructed the KMT and allowed CCP guerrillas to move in. In fact the apparent strength of the KMT was deceptive: in 1948 the ever increasing communist armies were large enough to abandon their guerrilla campaign and challenge Chiang's armies directly. As soon as they came under direct pressure, the KMT armies began to disintegrate. In January 1949 the communists took Peking, and later in the year Chiang and what remained of his forces ^{fled} ~~to~~ to the island of Taiwan, leaving Mao Tse-Tung in command of mainland China.

There were several reasons for the CCP triumph: the communists continued to win popular support by their restrained land policy which varied according to the needs of particular areas - some or all of a landlord's estates might be confiscated and redistributed among the peasants, or there might simply be rent restriction; communist armies were well-disciplined and communist administration was honest and scrupulously fair. On the other hand the KMT administration was inefficient and corrupt, much of its American aid finding its way into the pockets of

officials; its policy of paying for the wars by printing extra money resulted in galloping inflation which caused hardship for the masses and ruined many of the middle classes. Its armies were poorly paid and were allowed to loot the countryside; subjected to communist propaganda, they gradually became disillusioned with Chiang and began to desert to the Communists. The KMT tried to terrorise the local population into submission, but this only alienated more areas. Towards the end, Chiang also made some tactical blunders; like Hitler he could not bear to order retreats and consequently his scattered armies were surrounded and often, as at Peking and Shanghai, surrendered without resistance, totally disillusioned. Finally the CCP leaders, Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai, were shrewd enough to take advantage of KMT weaknesses and were completely dedicated; the communist general Lin Piao, Chu Teh and Ch'en Yi, had prepared their armies carefully and were more competent tactically than their KMT counterparts.

ANTI-IMPERIALIST MOVEMENT IN CHINA

China in the 19th century lived in a world of her own. The Manchu dynasty rested on the mandate of Heaven. The Confucian ideology along with the Mandarins was expected to provide answers to every problem. There was not even an iota of nationalist sentiment, nor were the Chinese aware of the threat of imperialism.

Prior to the Opium Wars and the Treaty Port System the Chinese regarded the presence of foreigners to be more of a nuisance than anything else. They were often referred to as barbarians; whereas, the Chinese were heaven blessed people. In the Chinese documents of the day very vigorous and colourful phrases were used for the foreigners -- inherently cunning and malicious, insatiable and avaricious, self-seekers with the feelings of gods and sheep, and fickle and inconstant. Their assessment of America was that it was maritime, uncultivated and primitive. Apart from such a view of the threat that was posed by the foreigners the Chinese believed in the traditional remedy of solving disputes by compromise. *society was to be harmonized not changed.* Even when the first treaty was concluded in 1842 with the foreigners, the Chinese regarded it as a compromise which brought peace and a measure of time. They thought that perhaps the problem would go away.

This unresponsiveness of China was the natural consequence of a very old economic system. The Chinese wealth was concentrated in massive farm economy, working by an almost unlimited supply of labour skilled in ancient methods of tilling the soil. The Chinese economic doctrine was concerned largely with the proper use of revenue in public works rather than with the encouragement of economic growth. The Chinese system was such that it was

in 1864. The leader committed suicide while his son was caught and executed.

Although the Taiping rebellion was aimed against the Manchus, who were foreigners of China, it cannot be regarded as an anti-imperialist movement in the real sense, but some of the consequences that flowed out of the rebellion later facilitated the emergence of nationalist sentiment and from then onwards matured as the anti-imperialist movement. The Taiping rebels attacked the Confucian bureaucracy as intellectually hollow and socially corrupt. This denotion of Confucius was an important stage in the evolution of national sentiment. Moreover, in the wake of the defeat of the Taiping rebellion, Prince Kung favoured more and more of Chinese as officials even at the level of provincial governors, thereby leading to the resurgence of the Chinese while the Manchus were gradually relegated to the background. Added to this,³ the structure of political power within China was altered radically as a result of this upheaval. The centralized military organization lost its practical power and the military power came to be diffused in various provincial and local areas. With this diffusion of military authority went also a comparable diffusion of fiscal authority and ultimately peking's administrative control. The continuing conflict between centralism and regionalism in the coming years had far-reaching results in the 20th century. It was only after the decline and disappearance of the central authority and the baptism of provincial rivalries and wars that made the articulate Chinese think of China in a different image. In other words, the total disappearance of the central authority as well as the Manchu ruler enabled the Chinese to entertain the idea that China was a nation by itself.

As already remarked the post-treaty system era witnessed the increasing erosion of Chinese autonomy and sovereignty by the penetration of foreign powers in the form of extracting more concessions as well as securing the right to make heavy investments in Chinese ventures like railway construction and thereby effectively dividing China into spheres of influence.

In this period the Western powers succeeded in detaching the non-Chinese areas which accepted the suzerainty of China in the preceding centuries. Cambodia and Annam were the first to go. Burma were annexed by Britain in 1886. The Tientsin Catholic Mission encouraged kidnapping of Chinese children who were later baptized into Christianity. When there was a popular revolt against this missionary activity the Western powers presented a collective note to the Peking government even though France and Germany were at war in Europe!

In the same period occurred two more developments which gradually made the nationalist awareness of the day grow more along the anti-imperialist path. The Western powers realized that the Chinese market was not as vast as it earlier was thought to be. Then onwards the European powers laid stress on investments. Secondly, the Western powers developed the pig trade - Chinese labourers were illegally captured and shipped to various colonies of Britain, Spain and Portugal as slave labour. They were transported in ships known as Floating Hells, in which the mortality rate was as high as 40%.

It became obvious that the military and political authority of the empire was shattered. Just at this juncture, China had to confront Japan. Japan forced a treaty on Korea and claimed that it was completely independent although China had suzerain rights over Korea from a long

period of time. Within Korea there occurred a revolt against Japan and the Korean government appealed to China for help. When China came to the rescue of Korea, it was defeated and agreed to the Treaty of Shimonoseki -- China recognized the independence of Korea while ceding Formosa, Pescadores to Japan and paying a huge indemnity.

This treaty was a turning point in the attitude of China towards the West. It irreparably damaged the international standing of China. The court proved itself to be ^{too} impotent ^{to} give any leadership while the old classes that supported the imperial regime lost their prestige and authority. Soon enough the western powers took advantage of the rapid decay of China ^{and} secured sole rights to construct railways and opening of mines. Thus came the doctrine of the spheres of influence by which it was claimed that China should not surrender territories to any other powers. Within three years of the Sino-Japanese war, China was effectively parcelled out for economic activity, for political influence and railway development.

By the end of the 19th century the end of de jure partition of China was a serious threat. Italian cruisers appeared in the China sea. Suddenly one more inarticulate movement against the foreigners appeared on the Chinese scene. In the countryside was formed the Society of Harmonious Fists or Boxers. The motto of the Boxers was to cherish the dynasty and exterminate the foreigners. The Empress supported them. Alarmed by the development the foreigners demanded the suppression of the Boxers and ordered naval manoeuvres to overawe the court. Infuriated by these moves, the Boxers swarmed into Peking and rose in revolt. Fighting broke out in Tientsin, Taku and Peking. The Westerners could defend themselves in the cities, but in the countryside the Christian missionaries had to pay a

very heavy price. The West retaliated in Peking and Tientsin. They acted with utmost brutality. A crucial and humiliating peace was thrust on China known as the Boxer Protocol -- suspension of official examination for five years, prohibition of importing of arms and ammunition for four years, payment of enormous indemnity and conceding the right of foreigners to fortify their legations.

The period between the Boxer rebellion and the downfall of the Manchus was the hey-day of Western authority in China. But underneath this high tide of Western influence new forces started gathering. The new class of Chinese associated with Europe and capital disliked the privileges of European businessmen in China. Revolutionary leaders took advantage of the political freedom in foreign settlements. Boycott became a powerful weapon -- boycott of American goods against the treatment given to the Chinese in the USA. This was the beginning of the nationalist or the anti-imperialist movement.

The Empress or the Old Buddha died in 1908 and the empire continued for three more years before revolution overtook it. The national revolution of China started as a mutiny in Hankow and the Manchu dynasty fell without even striking a blow. Indeed the revolution was ineffective for the first few years but before the lapse of a decade the European control, too, started collapsing like the Manchu empire.

Sun Yat-sen was elected as the provincial President of Nanking in 1911. But in 1912, he retired in favour of Yuan Shih-kai. A parliamentary model was set up. Yuan outwitted the revolutionaries by relying on the moderates and seeking a foreign loan to suppress a military revolt. The foreign powers recognized the new regime but they refused to deal with it as the sole authority of China since

the warlords gained control of Peking. The Westerners chose to recognize the regime in Peking, but not the one in Hanking as they were interested in saving the loans advanced to China. This caused resentment amongst the forward-looking Chinese people and thereby added to the anti-imperialist sentiment.

After Yuan died, Dr. Sun took over the leadership. He established the republican regime at Canton. He, too, sought the help of Westerners but they refused to change their stand. This forced Dr. Sun to seek the help of the new revolutionary government in Moscow. Coupled with this, the Communist government in Moscow surrendered most of the concessions that the Czarist government extracted from China. Dr. Sun invited a Chinese delegation and came to an agreement with it. In the meantime, small groups of Communists were found within China and abroad too. Both these small segments of Chinese Communists were attracted by the explicit anti-imperialist stand of the Soviet Government. Furthermore, once the Communists came to the forefront the distinction between nationalist and anti-imperialist movements ceased to exist since the communist strategy for the colonial countries as developed by Lenin emphasized the point that imperialism backed by capitalism was the real enemy of all subject peoples struggling for freedom.

As a small segment of the conscious Chinese nationals moved towards Soviet Union, the Japanese aggressed more and more started with their notorious 21 demands presented to Yuan during the First World War. Surprisingly, no western power came to the rescue of China although the West was shocked when they came to know some of the demands made by Japan. Added to this, the Chinese demand for return of Shantung province at the Versailles, which was

earlier taken by Germany, was turned down. This rebuff also added to the anti-imperialist movement of China. The most important factor that made the anti-imperialist movement mature was the brazen and outrageous aggression of Japan against China from 1931 onwards. By then, as already remarked above, an important segment of the Chinese society started moving away from the western heritage while seeking inspiration from the Soviet model. Coupled with this, the Communist party within China grew in importance. After Chiang Kai-shek butchered the communists in the coup of 1927, the Communist party was forced to fend for itself. The Communists led by Mao in the first stages allied themselves with bandit gangs and soon the statesmanship of Mao made them win the support of the peasant community in the northern parts of China. By then, Chiang Kai-shek showed more eagerness to eliminate the Communists rather than right the growing Japanese menace. Half heartedly he did compromise with the Communists in 1937 to put up a common front against Japan. The intrinsic weakness of the Kuomintang regime made it lose its control rapidly during the massive onslaught of Japanese invasion on China while the Communists tactfully preserved their own strength and changed their old military tactics and strategy.

In the end the Communists came out victorious, that is, the Communists became the custodians and inheritors of the anti-imperialist movement of China. The imperialist powers were too greedy and too self-seeking to understand the way in which patriotic sentiment and then the anti-imperialist sentiment and movement came into existence. It was the failure of the West that was at the base of the final success of anti-imperialist movement in China, which whether fortunately or unfortunately, came to be aligned with the Communist philosophy.

STAGES OF COLONIALISM IN INDIA: MERCANTILIST
FREE TRADE AND FINANCE CAPITAL

Colonialism meaning alien rule with its consequential unjust and exploitative rule of subject people was experienced by India from the very beginning of the British establishment in India as the de facto rulers. The East India Company, although prohibited by the law at home, acquired sovereign rights in India.

Prior to the acquisition of the de facto sovereign right over Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, the Company concentrated on trade while obtaining a few necessary concessions from the local rulers to protect their establishments known as factories. And with the establishment of the de facto rule in Bengal, Bihar and Orissa in 1765, the ugly features of commercialism or Mercantilism made their appearance. The privileges extended to the Company were misused by its servants. Without any compunction, the servants of the Company extracted money from rulers like Mir Jaffar and Mir Qasim. During this period of Mercantilist exploitation, the British were instrumental for the total destruction of the textile industry which was reputed from a long time. While the Company servants plundered the region either by foul or fair means, the English commercial interests pressurized the government at home to impose punitive fines and punishments for importing or possessing Indian textiles. The net result was that the Company became bankrupt while its servants grew rich. Added to this, the Company also failed to pay the licence fee that was obligatory to pay every year to the government at home.

Foiled by this reason, the British Government imposed a half-hearted and partial control on the organization and the activities of the company. The

...../-

introduction of money transactions caused enormous difficulties to the farmers. A large number of farmers grew indebted and land came to be grabbed by money-lenders who later established themselves as the new landed oligarchy. The economic misery of the 19th century was the direct result of the free trade and other policies pursued by Britain.

Even while Britain pursued free trade policy in India to the detriment of Indian interests, finance capital too made its appearance. Banking, insurance, shipping and such other ventures came to be monopolized by foreign firms. The administration even created difficulties for Indian entrepreneurs to establish their own factories: the one exception was the founding of the Tata iron industry during the second decade of the 20th century. In other words, the finance capital of Britain did not permit indigenous capitalists to come up. In a way, Indian capitalism suffered from infantile paralysis and this distortion in the growth of capitalism could be seen even till today.

Most of all the economy of India got distended. Cash crops were grown for exports while no effort was made to improve the production of foodgrains. As the British were interested in keeping rural aristocracy as their supporters, nothing was done to prevent fragmentation of land and securing the just rights of peasants. In the industrial field only consumer industries came up and the impetus to the pattern of growth and provided by the requirements of Britain like the American Civil War and the two World Wars. In the educational field very little was done to promote engineering studies. Thus in the phrase of Andre Gunder Frank India witnessed the "development of underdevelopment."

As the above picture shows, India suffered during all the phases (mercantilist, free trade and finance company) of the British rule. Yet, there were certain benefits that accrued to India. Introduction of a system of education, the Anglo-Saxon system of law, network of communications, and a uniform pattern of administration, were indeed benefits. A close examination of these benefits, however, shows that all of them were meant for the benefit of the colonial power rather than of the subject people: railways primarily for the movement of troops and for the dumping of western goods in every nook and corner of India; the communication network was for the purpose of upholding the British bayonet; the educational system was for the purpose of training some colonial people to serve the ends of the British administration; and uniform administration was for the convenience of the rulers and also for systematic and regular collection of revenue. Indeed, a few steps were taken by the British Raj for the purpose of ameliorating the social life of the people, like abolition of sati and thuggi, enabling widows, by law, to get married, reviving the ancient heritage of India and even encouraging the ventilation of the peoples' opinion. All these efforts were occasioned because of the fact the colonial powers from 1870 onwards took on themselves the responsibility of bringing up the orphaned colonial peoples of the world. The colonial powers thought that they had a mission to fulfil, summed up as "white man's burden" by Kipling. In other words, whatever little good that came to India was because of the economic exploitation of the day being associated with some fair principles in their home countries.

Ultimately, as the irony of fate would have it, the half-hearted and unwitting measures that were taken

...../-

by the British acted as a catalyst for the awakening of India. This process began a few years before the mid of the 19th century and by the end of the 19th century it became a regular tide. From the 20th century onwards, the awakening came to be closely identified with nationalist sentiment and the struggle for freedom. In a way, colonialism had dug its own grave. The centre-place of colonialism was capitalism and probably there is some truth in the incisive remark of Karl Marx that capitalism would be destroyed by its own inner contradictions.

COMPARING NATIONALIST MOVEMENTS IN ASIA

Introduction

One may suggest that there are two broad paths: one, the 'revolutionary' and the other 'evolutionary'. On the former path lie Indonesia and Vietnam where colonial institutions and classes allied to the colonial powers were violently ended in the years after 1945. On the 'evolutionary' road lie the Philippines and India wherein colonial institutions -- the civil service, business houses, the army -- survived intact. Indeed, there was violence, e.g. hundreds of thousands died during the partition of India in 1947. But in both instances, the governments to whom the colonial powers transferred authority withstood the shocks.

What landmarks can one expect to find on each of the two broad paths? On the one marked 'evolutionary', one may suggest:

- A long period of colonial rule that, however grudgingly fostered education and participatory government.
- A large Westernised elite, the product of generations familiar with and sympathetic to the existing structure of government.
- A relatively small number of European residents.
- A large and well-developed colonial bureaucracy and army staffed by local people.
- A colonial government ready, for various reasons, to release its grip.

On the path marked 'revolutionary', one might look for:

A relatively short period of colonial rule.

Little Western-style education.

No nationwide Westernised elite until well into the twentieth century.

Larger number of European residents.

Little participatory government.

A heavy colonial economic interest in the country.

A colonial power unwilling to leave.

The Economic Setting

Imperialism is based on advantage, profit and exploitation. European powers began their activities in Asia as traders and ended as rulers. Though talked much of white men's burdens, profit remained the dominant concern of the majority.

France and the Netherlands leaned heavily on their Asian colonies. The Dutch plaintively argued that they were running a vast tropical estate for the benefit of the world: a quarter of imports into Indonesia in 1939 came from the Netherland and about a seventh of exports went there.

Similarly by 1939, the Bank of Indochina was one of the richest enterprises in France, owning 110 undertakings throughout the world. Though any explanation of France's intransigence in Indochina in 1945-46 needs to include the desperate longing to re-establish French military prestige after the humiliations of the Second World War, one must also emphasise France's huge economic stake. One can construct an enticing argument that France and Holland clung to their empires in Asia with such ferocity because their commercial connection was so important to so many of their people.

In India, however, the strong links of private gain had weakened. By 1945, less than 20 per cent of India's imports were coming from British factories (in 1900: 69 per cent) and only about 28 per cent of India exports were going to Britain (in 1879: 53 per cent). The British in

...../-

1945 had given up any idea of attempting to hold India by force. This stemmed partly from realism: after the war it would have been an almost impossible task and politically disastrous for any British government to venture this. Partly, too, though the economic relationship had attenuated; fewer Britons derived economic benefit from India as Frenchmen did from Indochina, Dutch from the Indies, or indeed, the Britons from Malaya.

The Condition of the People

The living conditions of the majority of subjects worsened during colonial rule. The imperial powers, sometimes directly (as in the 'culture system' in Indonesia), sometimes indirectly, induced peasants to grow non-edible cash crops. In India, peasants had to turn, apart from cash crops, to 'elite' foodgrains like wheat and rice intended for sale instead of coarser grains consumed locally. The commercial agriculture drove the disruptive elements of a cash economy deep into old societies. At the same time, the flexibility of local customs was replaced by the rigidity of codified, Western-style law. Village lands, often held in common in the past, became privately 'owned'. The effect was worst perhaps in Vietnam, least in Malaya; but the phenomenon was to be found in every area. Societies were pulled apart. Families that had for generations tilled land in a locality became, if they were lucky, owners; if they were unlucky, tenants; or, unluckier still, simply labourers. The new legal system, with laws on debt and private property, was backed by colonial police forces that were often corrupt and inefficient but invariably powerful enough to evict tax defaulters or foreclose on mortgages.

Elite and Leaders

The leaders of the independence movements did not come from the afflicted peasantries. They came, as one would expect, from classes educated in the ways of the West and experiencing the tension of two cultures warring within a single man or woman. Of the men who presided over their countries at independence, only Ho Chi Minh could in any way be described as having a non-elite background. But on the other hand, Jawaharlal Nehru and M.A. Jinnah in India, Sukarno in Indonesia -- were all products of families that had enjoyed prestige and influence not only under the foreign rulers but in pre-colonial times as well.

The size and extent of the Westernised elite varied from the length of colonial rule and the colonial power's commitment to education.

Communists

In 1941 communist parties in colonial Asia were illegal or virtually non-existent. The Indonesian Communist Party, the PKI, had been smashed and banned in the 1920s. The Indo-chinese Communist Party was constantly harassed by the French colonial police, and Ho Chi Minh managed very late to return from exile. In India, the party had been banned since 1934. All except the Indian communists had from the 1920s began to look to China as their exemplars, even if the front of wisdom lay theoretically in Moscow. Japan's war on China from 1937 identified the Japanese as the potential enemy.

With Japan's conquest of South-East Asia, communist parties found themselves in the frontline, custodians in many ways of national honour and decency, and allies, sometimes, of the former colonial masters. In Vietnam, the Viet Minh led the struggle against the Japanese. Even in Indonesia, where the communist party was perhaps weakest,

...../-

it gained respect for its efforts at resistance. Only in India did the communists fail to enhance their strength and reputation during the war. Legalised in July 1942, the party had thrown its support behind the British war effort after the invasion of the Soviet Union. It denounced the Indian National Congress, which opposed the war and launched the Quit India movement in August, and dubbed it as a 'fifth column' of the fascists. In countries the Japanese overran, it was all very well for communists to link arms with the ex-colonial masters to fight fascism. But in India, where British rule remained, the Communist-Imperialist alliance appeared to be directed as much against the Indian National Congress as Japan. Nor did the communists in India acquire arms, as they did elsewhere. Their position after the war left them open to denunciation as collaborators of the British and traitors to true nationalism. This contrasted dramatically with the situation in Vietnam and Indonesia, where the communists emerged from the war with enhanced respect, arms and the real prospect of capturing power.

Similarities and Dissimilarities

To elaborate more, there were parallels in the experiences of nationalist movements preceding independence, dissimilarities in the critical final years and the widely differing socio-political processes that determined the means by which independence was secured. One common experience of nations struggling for independence was the external events like the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-5, the First World War of 1914-48, the momentous Bolshevik Revolution of Russia in 1917. In the 20s, a sense of quiet had spread through the colonial countries, but it was shattered from 1929 onwards with the onset of the Great Depression. And with the outbreak of Second World

...../-

2. 433

War in 1939 global events of immense magnitude came to dominate struggles of the colonial nations. It is equally interesting to note that the defeat of the Axis Powers in 1945 was portentous for the struggling countries and the beginnings of the Cold War soon afterwards cast its shadow over them.

At the beginning of the 20th century, elites like Tilak, Gokhale, Banerji and Naoroji appeared in India; Phan Boi Chau and his contemporaries, in Vietnam; and Kartini in Java. The momentum came to these developments by the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-5. For the ensuing 10 years, a number of violent nationalist upheavals occurred. They were generally organised by elitist groups though on a small scale. In almost every case, they were essentially designed to scare the imperialists. They were very striking in India and Vietnam. The result of it was the farsighted nationalists were made to strike some different possibilities.

The situation after 1918 showed differences. The post First World War witnessed a quiet new temper in almost all the countries of Asia: May Fourth movement in China, Home Rule League and the first Gandhi Satyagraha in India, developments within Sarekat Islam in Indonesia, etc. Also, the final destruction of Ottoman Empire had an influence on Indonesia; it directly inspired the Khilafat Movement in India. The movements in both the countries soon got free from the Muslim tide. They decided that they could organise mass movements. On the other hand, in Vietnam there was no such change in the stance of the nationalists. There the elitist nationalism persisted.

One striking similarity about the 1920s in Asia however was that the various communist initiatives suffered severe setbacks. The Dutch crushed a communist revolt in Java and Sumatara in 1926-27. By the long-winded

...../-

Merut Conspiracy Case the British swept the Indian communist leaders into jail. The French crushed a number of peasant revolts inspired by communists in Vietnam.

In late 1920s the educated Indonesians gathered under the banner of Sukarno to mount a radical nationalist campaign. Peasant-oriented leadership emerged. A new Congress under Gandhiji with leaders such as Rajendra Prasad, Vallabhbhai Patel and Abdul Gaffor Khan, along with several younger leaders like Nehru and Bose.

The colonial powers of those areas were equally determined to crush these new challenges. Vietnam witnessed a white terror of the French in 1930-31. Britain ruthlessly suppressed Gandhi's two Civil Disobedience Movements of 1930-31 and 1932-34. In Indonesia Sukarno was detained by the Dutch in 1933.

Nevertheless, by the mid-1930s there were significant recoveries. With the establishment of Popular Front Government in France in 1936, a few political freedoms were restored in Vietnam. These freedoms were used in a very skilful manner by the Indo-Chinese Communist Party. In 1937 the National Congress in India secured control of the 7 of the 11 provincial governments. In Indonesia alone there was no movement worth speaking except collaboration on the part of the nationalists. All these movements were of significance for the future. Everywhere the nationalists undermined the existing regimes' local supporters. The anti-Congress liberals were weakened in India and the Constitutionalist Party in Vietnam. The Communist Party of Vietnam replaced the VNQDD as the leading national party. The Congress in India showed its ability to win massive electoral victory. Sukarno's pre-eminence in Indonesia was becoming firmly entrenched.

At that time came the Second World War giving a new fillip to the nationalist movement. Nehru in India, Sjahrir

...../

in Indonesia and many others stood out as the opponents of Japanese imperialism. With reverses, the Japanese tried to push some of the nationalist leaders into prominent positions in order to checkmate the return of colonial powers. In 1945 the Japanese elevated King Bao Dai as the head of an independent Vietnamese state. In Indonesia, the Japanese military leaders gave active support to the nationalists.

In late 1945 also there continued to be parallels in their affairs. The leaders of the radical forces felt much could be gained by diplomacy. The Indian leaders met Wavell in Simla in 1945 which led to the Cabinet Mission in the following year. Ho Chi Minh signed an agreement and attended a conference in Paris in 1946. The Indonesian leaders signed an agreement with the Dutch in 1947 and 1948.

However, it was the aftermath of the Second World War (1946-50) that the final triumph occurred of the nationalist forces in all these countries, in Indo-china it was partly secured in 1954 and not finally until 1975.

Now for the dis-similarities. Both Ho Chi Minh and Sukarno controlled some of the major cities of their countries by the time they achieved independence. In the middle of the late 40s there were leftist revolts in India and in Indonesia which were checked. Only Ho Chi Minh with his Yeman in Cao Bang, managed to survive the post-war onslaughts against the Communists. In each of these cases the imperial powers saw to establish regimes with which they could hope to live in the future.

A more striking difference was that the Americans in the Philippines and the British in South Asia had clearly decided to depart by the end of the Second World War, while the French and Dutch still hoped to hold on to the territories. Logically, both in Indonesia and in

...../-

Vietnam, nationalist leaders could not rely on diplomacy and they had to seek an armed conflict with the ruling powers. Both in Indonesia and Vietnam the nationalist forces had the opportunities to build up an effective nucleus of their own military forces during the war. In China, Mao had raised the Red Army in the Northern parts of China. In Indonesia, the Japanese encouraged the creation of PETA, which became the nucleus for the Indonesian Republican Army. In Vietnam, Ho Chi Minh and Giap were able to develop a key military base for their revolutionary forces in Northern Tonkin.

Another interesting difference was the failure of the Communist Parties to go rural in India and in Indonesia as compared to China and Vietnam. Possibly this failure was because the rural structures in these countries did not collapse as in Vietnam and China and to some extent in Indonesia. A far more fundamental difference was that the Communists, both in China and in Vietnam, unlike the Communists in India and Indonesia, had independence as their goal.

in Indonesia and many others stood out as the opponents of Japanese imperialism. With reverses, the Japanese tried to push some of the nationalist leaders into prominent positions in order to checkmate the return of colonial powers. In 1945 the Japanese elevated King Bao Dai as the head of an independent Vietnamese state. In Indonesia, the Japanese military leaders gave active support to the nationalists.

In late 1945 also there continued to be parallels in their affairs. The leaders of the radical forces felt much could be gained by diplomacy. The Indian leaders met Wavell in Simla in 1945 which led to the Cabinet Mission in the following year. Ho Chi Minh signed an agreement and attended a conference in Paris in 1946. The Indonesian leaders signed an agreement with the Dutch in 1947 and 1948.

However, it was the aftermath of the Second World War (1946-50) that the final triumph occurred of the nationalist forces in all these countries, in Indo-china it was partly secured in 1954 and not finally until 1975.

Now for the dis-similarities. Both Ho Chi Minh and Sukarno controlled some of the major cities of their countries by the time they achieved independence. In the middle of the late 40s there were leftist revolts in India and in Indonesia which were checked. Only Ho Chi Minh with his Yeman in Cao Bang, managed to survive the post-war onslaughts against the Communists. In each of these cases the imperial powers saw to establish regimes with which they could hope to live in the future.

A more striking difference was that the Americans in the Philippines and the British in South Asia had clearly decided to depart by the end of the Second World War, while the French and Dutch still hoped to hold on to the territories. Logically, both in Indonesia and in

...../-

Vietnam, nationalist leaders could not rely on diplomacy and they had to seek an armed conflict with the ruling powers. Both in Indonesia and Vietnam the nationalist forces had the opportunities to build up an effective nucleus of their own military forces during the war. In China, Mao had raised the Red Army in the Northern parts of China. In Indonesia, the Japanese encouraged the creation of PETA, which became the nucleus for the Indonesian Republican Army. In Vietnam, Ho Chi Minh and Giap were able to develop a key military base for their revolutionary forces in Northern Tonkin.

Another interesting difference was the failure of the Communist Parties to go rural in India and in Indonesia as compared to China and Vietnam. Possibly the failure was because the rural structures in these countries did not collapse as in Vietnam and China and to some extent in Indonesia. A far more fundamental difference was that the Communists, both in China and in Vietnam, unlike the Communists in India and Indonesia, had independence as their goal.

in Indonesia and many others stood out as the opponents of Japanese imperialism. With reverses, the Japanese tried to push some of the nationalist leaders into prominent positions in order to checkmate the return of colonial powers. In 1945 the Japanese elevated King Bao Dai as the head of an independent Vietnamese state. In Indonesia, the Japanese military leaders gave active support to the nationalists.

In late 1945 also there continued to be parallels in their affairs. The leaders of the radical forces felt much could be gained by diplomacy. The Indian leaders met Wavell in Simla in 1945 which led to the Cabinet Mission in the following year. Ho Chi Minh signed an agreement and attended a conference in Paris in 1946. The Indonesian leaders signed an agreement with the Dutch in 1947 and 1948.

However, it was the aftermath of the Second World War (1946-50) that the final triumph occurred of the nationalist forces in all these countries, in Indo-china it was partly secured in 1954 and not finally until 1975.

Now for the dis-similarities. Both Ho Chi Minh and Sukarno controlled some of the major cities of their countries by the time they achieved independence. In the middle of the late 40s there were leftist revolts in India and in Indonesia which were checked. Only Ho Chi Minh with his Yeman in Cao Bang, managed to survive the post-war onslaughts against the Communists. In each of these cases the imperial powers saw to establish regimes with which they could hope to live in the future.

A more striking difference was that the Americans in the Philippines and the British in South Asia had clearly decided to depart by the end of the Second World War, while the French and Dutch still hoped to hold on to the territories. Logically, both in Indonesia and in

...../-

Vietnam, nationalist leaders could not rely on diplomacy and they had to seek an armed conflict with the ruling powers. Both in Indonesia and Vietnam the nationalist forces had the opportunities to build up an effective nucleus of their own military forces during the war. In China, Mao had raised the Red Army in the Northern parts of China. In Indonesia, the Japanese encouraged the creation of PETA, which became the nucleus for the Indonesian Republican Army. In Vietnam, Ho Chi Minh and Giap were able to develop a key military base for their revolutionary forces in Northern Tonkin.

Another interesting difference was the failure of the Communist Parties to go rural in India and in Indonesia as compared to China and Vietnam. Possibly this failure was because the rural structures in these countries did not collapse as in Vietnam and China and to some extent in Indonesia. A far more fundamental difference was that the Communists, both in China and in Vietnam, unlike the Communists in India and Indonesia, had independence as their goal.